THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—JANUARY, 1903—No. 109.

THE CRUSADES: HOW MEDIÆVAL EUROPE EXPANDED.

IF the venerable cathedrals of Europe are the highest expression of the domestic or internal life of mediæval Catholicism, the Crusades are its principal public and political enterprise. By the Crusades we understand great armed expeditions of Christian Europe, undertaken at the command or suggestion of the Pope, with the purpose of rescuing the Holy Land from the control of the Mussulmans. They were originally meant as pious and religious works. Whoever joined them wore upon his breast a cross of cloth, and took a vow to fight for the Sepulchre of Jesus Christ and never to return to Europe before he had prayed within its holy precincts. They cover a period of two hundred years—the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, during which time all Europe resounded to the tread of martial men, and the sublime cry of "God wills it, God wills it" was heard from Sicily to Norway. In this period the whole cycle of human passions was aroused, every human interest found a voice, and every human activity a channel or outlet.

In these two hundred years took place the transition of the European man from youth to manhood. He enters upon the twelfth century a creature of the heart, of sentiment and emotion, ignorant of the great world beyond his little hamlet or castle. He emerges from the thirteenth century, both layman and ecclesiastic, with world-wide experience, a clearer view of the relations of society

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

to history and geography, and with new qualities of mind and heart. The Crusades were often very human enterprises, and more than once degenerated from their sacred character, to become instruments of injustice and political folly. They have their dark and regrettable phases, and perhaps their influence has been, on given occasions and in given circumstances, detrimental. This is no more than can be said of many great historical movements, laudable in their spirit and original intention, only to degenerate with time and the irresistible force of circumstances or environment. Taken as a whole, they are the most important collective enterprise in the history of European mankind. They were an official work of Catholicism, as represented by its Supreme Head, the Bishop of Rome. He first instigated them; he roused the timid, hesitating kings and nobles; his letters awakened the Catholic multitudes in every land; his spiritual favors attracted them about the banners of their kings and princes; his legates marched at the head of every expedition. When all others grew weary and faint-hearted, he maintained courage and resolution. When cupidity and self-interest supplanted the original motives of faith and devotion to the Holy Land, he constantly recalled the true significance of these warlike expeditions. Whether the Crusades were the beginning of his great power in the Middle Ages, or the first step to the shipwreck of it, he was always their central figure. The public life of these two centuries really revolved about two poles—Rome and Jerusalem.

The peoples of mediæval Europe, like all simple peoples with their life-experience before them, were genuine hero-worshipers. They were feudal and military in their organization, very ardent, sympathetic and mobile. Religion was intelligible, tangible, in their saints and martyrs, just as the state secured their loyalty in and through the persons of their leaders, their counts, dukes, princes and kings. Loyalty was primarily to fixed persons in whom ideals and institutions were incarnate: to be a "masterless man" was equivalent to outlawry. Devotion and self-sacrifice were for persons and places —they had not yet learned to divide the abstract idea from its concrete expression.

Now, from their conversion to Catholicism, these peoples had cherished an intense devotion to the Person of Jesus Christ. He is their King who makes war against Satan, and the Apostles are his thanes, his generals, his counts and barons. His benign figure looks down from every altar, is enthroned in every apse, is sculptured on the walls, and uplifted over the doorway of every church. The first document of romantic theology is the well-known prologue to the Salic Law of the Franks. Since then all royal documents begin in His Name, all wills and testaments confess Him in

their opening paragraph. He is the beloved ideal of every heart, the burden of every discourse, the key-note of every original singer, and the inspiration of every immortal hymn. The first monument of mediæval Teutonic literature is the noble gospel-paraphrase of the ninth century known as the "Heliand"—in it Jesus Christ is the heavenly war-lord, worthy of all "Treue," symbol and fountain of all "Ehre." We shall never understand the Crusades, unless we grasp firmly the fact that the Middle Ages were a period of most universal and sincere devotion to the Person of Jesus Christ.

In such a world it was only natural that the severe penances needed to rouse a sense of sin in these rude and course natures should often take the form of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land where Jesus was born, lived and died. As the Middle Ages wore away, these pilgrimages grew in size and frequency. With the new religious spirit that created so many splendid churches in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries coincided some other things. The Popes had taken the popular side in their long struggle with the German Emperors, and had won the immediate victory. The great abbots of Cluny had aroused a new life all over Europe by their piety and that of the hundreds of monasteries which acknowledged their rule of life. After a long period of political inferiority and internal anarchy, the States of the West, disorganized since the death of Charlemagne, began to realize their strength. Vaguely it was felt that some common enterprise was needed to gather up all these new forces and currents.

In the great soul of Gregory VII., the man who more thoroughly than any other resumed the traditions and temper of the best Catholicism that preceded him, while he gave the watchwords for the centuries to come, this common enterprise was already clearly outlined, as early as the last quarter of the eleventh century. He saw that it would be better to consume the ardor and energy of men like the young and violent Henry VI. of Germany in efforts against a public, common, and threatening enemy, than to go on indefinitely in domestic broils and dissensions, Christian fighting against Christian, while all around the Mediterranean the Moslem was gradually spreading his power, and already threatened from very near that city of Constantinople which had so long been the bulwark of all the Christian population of the West. Indeed, the action of Sylvester II., the famous Gerbert (999-1003), would lead us to suspect that since the days of Gregory II., the "nec dicendi Hagareni" of the Liber Pontificalis had found in the papacy their native enemy. Islam was above all a religion, a warlike one in its essence and all its history, whose prosperity could only be gained at the expense of Christendom.

The time of Gregory VII. seemed also a favorable moment for the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches. Scarce two hundred years had passed since the death of Photius, the scholarly but infamous man who had caused the breach that still lies open, and withdrawn the Christian peoples of the East from their union with the Head of the Christian religion, the successor of St. Peter. Constantinople was now in sore need of help against the warlike Seljuk Turks, who had been encroaching very deeply on Asia Minor, and now held all the overland roads to Syria and Palestine. This great city, the London of the Middle Ages, had exhausted its means and its armies. On nearly every side the world of Islam was surrounding it like a moving bog, slowly but surely. Four centuries of superhuman efforts, of wonderful ingenuity, of diplomacy, had not availed to stave off the day of reckoning that began when Mohammed haughtily ordered the Roman Emperor of his own day to do him homage. As a matter of fact it took four more centuries to reduce the Royal City beneath the Crescent—but the tide was already turning that way, and at Constantinople people, patriarchs and emperors recognized too well the painful fact, though they could never fully reconcile themselves to it, nor adopt the proper measures of reconciliation with the West. Is not the secret of it all in those terrible pages of Liudprand of Cremona? In them there breathe yet the racial contempt of the Greek for the Frank, the hoarded hope of vengeance, the senseless pride of origin, the bitter resentment of the transfer of loyalty by the Roman See, the angry despair at the sight of a free and vigorous West.

II.

If Rome and Jerusalem were the poles around which revolves the history of the Crusades, the city of Constantinople is the key to their failure. In these two centuries many thousands of armed knights on horseback gave up their lives to the Crusades. Countless thousands of foot-soldiers and camp-followers, pilgrims and the like, perished in the attempt to free the Holy Places. There were two ways to reach Jerusalem, one by land down the Danube and through Thrace to Constantinople, thence over Asia Minor into Syria; the other by sea from Venice to Genoa, which cities alone had fleets of transport galleys in those days. For the first century the Crusaders went by land. Arrived at Constantinople, they abandoned themselves, too often, to excess, after the fatigues and privations of the long journey. The roads were poor and they were ignorant of the local topography. The populations they passed through were also ignorant, and often hostile. This was especially

the case as they left behind them the uncertain boundaries of the West and approached the territory of Constantinople, and the sphere of its influence. The semi-barbarian world of Hungary, Bulgaria and the Balkans was deeply troubled at their coming. Indeed, they were rightly troubled, for the military chiefs of the Crusaders too often had views differing from those of the pious clergy and people. Not always were their ambitions bounded by that

> Sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
> Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son.

They were mostly men of Norman blood or descent, state-destroyers and state-makers by profession. Many dreamed of new and rich feudal principalities, of independent sovereignties, of a golden life in the dreamy Orient. The law or custom of primogeniture, the feudal customs in favor of the eldest son, threw regularly a multitude of young ambitious men upon the theatre of European affairs, brothers of Kings, nephews of Queens, a mob of landless, disinherited men, and women, too, for whom fortune lay in the future and far away. They were the Conquistadori of the Middle Ages; to their ambitious, unholy, and evil counsels and purposes, is owing largely the failure of the religious scope of the Crusades. Between them on the one side, and the churchmen on the other, there was endless friction that often led to the gravest disasters.

It was in the time of the Crusades as in all other periods of human history—the genuine praiseworthy aims of religion were often perverted by the human instruments which acted in her name. The noble and useful ideals set forth at Rome and preached by a Saint Bernard, the high political advantages of the same, were perverted in the execution. Jerusalem was lost because a Bohemond or a Tancred set more store by a little feudal estate on the coast of Syria than by the real object of his vow. The Moslem's hour of division and weakness was allowed to go by, because Venice was jealous of the commercial superiority of Constantinople and plundered pitilessly, first the Crusaders themselves, and then her ancient suzerain, the great Royal City that, after all, had enabled Venice to rise by restraining the naval ambition of the Moslems, and preventing the Mediterranean from becoming the great lake of Islam, its easy highway into all Europe.

The Crusaders themselves, too often, listened to very earthly and low passions, and dissipated their numbers and strength before they came within sight of the Holy City. They carried along with them old burdens of jealousy, hatred, revenge, from their French or German homes. Upon the soil of Syria they cherished their traditional European policies and combinations. Their counsels were usually divided—those highly personal men who never recognized any

superior law at home, except through fear, were unlikely to bear the yoke of subordination abroad. Could Homer have arisen, he would have seen before Jerusalem or St. Jean d'Acre as before Ilion, no fewer armies than there were kings and princes, as many independent divisions as there were banners of great knights, as many sulking chiefs as there were disappointed ambitions. Many of them had never seen a great city. At that time all the cities of Europe were not worth, in wealth or luxury, the single city of Constantinople. Its brilliant civilization had never known interruption from the day of its foundation. As in modern London, the fattening currents of commerce had been flowing into it from the East and the West for seven hundred years and more. Its hundreds of splendid churches were almost equaled by the splendid civic buildings. The masterpieces of antiquity, the rich literature of ancient Greece, the traditions of all the arts, the high aristocratic sense of superiority, seemed to justify the proud attitude of the citizens towards these uneducated and coarse multitudes from the West. A profound bitterness, an almost inexplicable hatred of the Bishop of Rome, has always characterized the Greek clergy of Constantinople. Their claim was always that the clergy of the New Rome was the equal in authority and the superior in learning and refinement of the clergy of Old Rome. Here, by the Golden Horn, the traditions of the ancient imperial government were never broken, never forgotten. Each Christian Emperor felt that he was the genuine successor of Julius Cæsar and Augustus. The Western nations—England, France, Germany, Italy—were to him revolted provinces, that some mysterious design of God tolerated. No Emperor of Constantinople ever willingly addressed the German successors of Charlemagne as Emperor, only as King. In theory, the Greek Emperor was himself the Master of the civilized universe. This, too, although century by century his civil power waned. North, South, East, and West, the limits of empire were pared away. But the Romaic Cæsar at Constantinople only gathered with more dignity the folds of his purple robes, and prepared to perish with more fortitude amid the rising tides of modern barbarism. There is nothing more pathetic in history than this survival of ancient ideals and habits of political life. The aristocracy of Constantinople was politically rotten to the core, yet it remained stoically contemptuous of its Latin conquerors, from the impregnable strongholds of its own mind and heart. The mediæval knight might have saved Constantinople, if the classic soul of Old Rome, proud and exclusive, had not been so deeply infused into the organism of her prouder daughter, the New Rome. It was in the time of the Crusades, as it is to-day with the Greek clergy of that city—better a hundred times the rule

of the Crescent than any subjection to the Pope, better the sour bread of slavery and oppression than any recognition of the descendants of the Goths and Vandals.

In the beginning there was almost no order or harmony among the chiefs of the Crusades, and when they reached the Imperial City, their own greedy passions and its great weakness conspired to make them common pillagers, thieves and oppressors. To get rid of them the wily Greeks induced them to cross the Bosphorus, led them against the hordes of Turks, then betrayed and abandoned them. These new protectors of the Greeks were worse than their old enemies. So the bones of entire armies soon whitened the plains of Asia Minor. By thousands the simple-hearted but ignorant knights of France, England and Germany paid with their lives for their turbulent career in Constantinople, for their impolitic insults to the Greek who did not acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as head of the Christian religion, for their innocent trust in the leadership of some Byzantine general.

In the second century of the Crusades they usually take the fleets of Venice or Genoa to cross the Mediterranean—but at an enormous expense. Once, indeed, Venice tempted them to overthrow the Christian Empire at Constantinople, which was now her commercial rival. In spite of the Pope this act of folly and injustice was accomplished, and the city of Constantinople saw its remaining provinces divided between Frenchmen and Venetians. This was in 1204, and was only the prelude to a series of disastrous expeditions, each one more fatal than the other, until at last in 1270, St. Louis, King of France, the leader of the eighth great Crusade, died of the pest at Tunis in Africa, whither his brother, Charles of Anjou, had drawn him, against the King's own judgment, in order to collect some bad debts that were owing to French and Italian traders.

As a matter of fact, the First Crusade, under the brave knight, Godfrey of Bouillon, did capture Jerusalem in 1098. For a century the Holy City was Christian. It was lost at the end of the twelfth century, and though for a short while again in Christian hands, from 1229 to 1245, it then definitely passed away from the control of Christian Europe into the hands of the oppressive and cruel Turk. Its possession had fired the heart of Christian Europe for three generations. But this fated city was too great a political prize for Islam to lose. Gradually the Moslems healed their divisions. The Turkish sultans, men of great military genius, broke down the hundred little emirs, and lifted the Leather Apron of their mining Turanian ancestors over one fortress after another from the confines of Persia to the waters of the Mediterranean. Here along the coast of Syria, the Crusaders had built up several little states, organized with all

the ingenuity of feudal lawyers, in such a way that the superior lord should have all the pomp and titles of authority and the most inferior vassal be left to his own sweet will and temper. The innermost of these states, Edessa, faced the Euphrates and long bore the brunt of the Moslem Orient. It was the first to fall. Before the end of the thirteenth century they had all disappeared, and only the picturesque ruins of their fortified hill-tops remain to show what were once the hopes of a great Christian state in the Orient.

III.

The popular enthusiasm for the Crusades was originally universal. Kings, even Emperors of the West, led their armies in person and underwent great hardships. A German Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, was drowned on the way across Asia Minor. St. Louis of France, as we have seen, died of the plague at Tunis. Noble princesses and high born ladies, too, accompanied these expeditions. But few of the great military chiefs stayed in the East. Most of the knights who remained were French, and it is to that period that goes back the use of the French language in the East, as well as the political prestige that France long enjoyed throughout the Mediterranean world.

In time experience taught these Crusaders who stayed in the Orient that the heavily armed knight of Europe, with his great battle horse, his huge lance and heavy sword, was ill fitted to carry on a guerilla warfare for the Holy Land. Three military orders arose, with reformed methods of warfare, that contributed much to the safety of pilgrims, the protection of Jerusalem, and of the fortified castles of Syria and Palestine. They were the Knights Hospitaller of St. John, the Knights of the Temple, and the Teutonic Knights. Originally established for the service of the sick, they became an organized feudal army of volunteers. Their castles arose all over the Holy Land, their bravery and adventures were in the mouth of every pilgrim. In them the romance and the poetry of the Crusades reached its height. All Europe looked on them as the true, the permanent Crusaders, and staked its hopes of recovery of the Holy Land on their skill and endurance. Thousands of estates were bestowed on them in the thirteenth century—their farms and castles stretched continuously from the Mediterranean to the Baltic and from the Atlantic to the Black Sea. It is in the vicissitudes of their history that we ought to look for the true ideal of the Crusades, and the measure of its realization.

The richest of them, the Templars, became the chief banking-house of Europe. In the fierce struggle between the Kings of

France and the Pope of Rome, the Knights of the Temple went down most tragically—the justice of their condemnation is yet, and perhaps always will be, an open question. The Teutonic Knights, after the loss of the Holy Land, turned their faces homeward to Germany. The soil of Prussia, then the home of barbarian pagan peoples, and of Northeastern Germany, was turned over to them, as a missionary brotherhood of laymen, with the purpose of overthrowing paganism and of establishing Christianity, incidentally of creating new marches for the Empire. Soon they were known as the Schwertbrüder, the Brothers of the Sword—a term that sufficiently well indicates the manner, if not the spirit, in which they propagated the gospel. Their splendid mediæval fortress still stands along the Baltic, the great pile of Marienburg, whence Pomerania, Lithuania, Esthonia, and all the border lands of Prussia and Russia received the Christian faith.

The Hospitallers, or Knights of St. John, after their expulsion from the Holy Land, clung still to the control of the port of Smyrna, and their fidelity has even yet its reward, for Smyrna is now to France what Shanghai is to England. Eventually they were established on the Island of Rhodes, where they remained until nearly four centuries ago (1520), when they were driven out by the Turk, after one of the most memorable sieges of history. Their last foothold on the Mediterranean was on the Island of Malta. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, they lost even this remnant of their old power, and with them the last glamor of the Crusades disappeared. There is yet an Order of the Knights of Malta, and the Pope still appoints a Grand Commander—but it is a mere ceremony. The old religious military orders, with their three vows of celibacy, poverty and obedience, have disappeared. Cardinal Lavigerie tried to establish one for the suppression of the slave-trade in the heart of Africa, but with indifferent success. Such institutions only flourish on the soil of simple and childlike faith; agnosticism and commercialism are too cold a soil for them.

In the Crusades took place the first great expansion of Europe. From the year 500 to the year 1100—for six hundred years—the peoples who now make up the great states of France, Germany, England, and Spain, were growing from infancy to mature youth, in a civic sense. All the rawness, weakness, waywardness, all the folly and strong violent passion of youth are upon them. They are in the hands of a gentle but firm nurse, the Catholic Church; but every now and then, they break away from school and there is pandemonium. The sea breaks out in the heart of the Anglo-Saxon, and the marsh in the heart of the Frank, the dark deep forest calls out in the soul of the German, and the Northman is again upon his

piratical galley. The early Middle Ages are apparently a perfect welter of disorder and anarchy. But somehow in the eleventh century, there is a beginning of better things. A King of France arises out of the wreckage of the French successors of Charlemagne's children. An Emperor grows strong, not only in name but in fact, among the Germans. He is in theory the Roman Emperor in the West, and though outside of Germany, his real power is small, this very theory of a one invisible Empire of Rome, that had never been destroyed, but only held in abeyance, as a trust, by the Bishop of Rome, gave once more a sacred, venerable character to the supreme civil authority. Then, too, the Roman Law was there as a significant commentary on what might be made out of the imperial name. The Church had saved it, assimilated it, christianized it, and in time the Emperors would use it as a leverage for far-reaching ambitions.

The old Gallo-Roman civilization had never utterly died out in France—the ancient Gaul, and now the traditions of old Rome in government and administration were handed down to the German Emperor by the clergy of Old Rome herself. In the traditions of architecture, in the use of the Latin classics, in legal procedure, in the continuous use of Latin as the tongue of religion, diplomacy and scholarship, the Roman Church had kept alive no little of the sober and practical Latin spirit—enough at least to act as a leaven for the new society that was to issue from the laboring womb of Europe. Thus, the modern world of Europe and America has become the daughter of the civilization of Rome and Greece, and not the theatre of Moslem propaganda.

It is true that the actual territory conquered from the Turks and held by the Christians of Europe, was never very great—the City of Jerusalem, some strongholds in Palestine, some ports in Syria. On the compact masses of Islam in Persia, Egypt and Northern Africa, they made little or no impression. In the Mediterranean the islands of Cyprus and Crete passed gradually into the possession of Venice. A corner of ancient Armenia remained some centuries semi-independent of Greek and Turk, under feudal influences of France. French families held on to feudal office and rights in Greece and the Archipelago. These were about all the positive gains and they have long since melted away. But the political results of the Crusades were very important in a negative and prohibitive way. Internally, the European States of Germany, France, England and Spain were very weak at the beginning of the Crusades. Feudalism had reached the point of utter disintegration. The royal authority, the concept of the State, all centralizing influences, were everywhere at their lowest ebb. Social anarchy was lifting threateningly its specter-like head. Shattering conflicts be-

tween the Church and immoral, arbitrary rulers were multiplying. Schisms in the Church, revolts and rebellions in the civil order, were growing. The warlike Turks, to whom had fallen the real power and wealth of the Caliphs at Bagdad and Cairo, were on the eve of capturing Constantinople. In great flotillas the equally warlike barbarians of the new states in Russia were coming down yearly by the Don and the Dnieper, and crossing the Black Sea with the same intention. The Arab kingdoms in Spain were at the height of their development. Had the Moslem Orient been left unmolested, free to carry on the Holy War according to the law of Mohammed, it would have found everywhere in Europe the Christians divided, ignorant of the great principles of the art of war, children in navigation, unable to carry on or resist sieges, half-barbarian and helpless in their diplomacy, the veriest lot of political infants one could imagine. From the summits of the Pyrenees, from the coasts of Sicily and Syria and Asia Minor, from the endless steppes of Russia, from the deepest Orient, would have come down again on the rich and tempting lands of Southern Europe hordes far worse than five or six centuries before had destroyed the Roman State. There is an organic law of preservation for states and civilizations that works like an instinct, and for Europe, since the days of Alaric and Attila, that instinct was incarnate in the Bishops of Rome. In spite of its unspeakable misfortunes, the Eternal City still held on to some of the large political traditions of antiquity. The very soil and the monuments kept them alive, as did the old laws of Rome and her spiritual authority that was recognized from the Mediterranean to the Baltic.

IV.

It was well for the world that at this time the West hurled itself upon the East and thereby arrested the political consolidation and growth of the latter. It did so at a propitious moment, when Islam was passing from the control of Arabs to that of Turks, and everywhere existed a feudal disorder not unlike that of the West. It accomplished the impossible in finding a splendid and inspiring symbol, the cross of Christ, for a dozen discordant nationalities. It seized on a psychological moment to weld into a common, conscious organic unity of Catholicism, all the nations of Europe that had hitherto been in communion, indeed, with Rome, but had not yet come into daily and vivifying contact with one another. In these long wars, the Moslem was made to fight for his existence; he was pushed finally out of the magnificent island of Sicily; he was driven from his perches in the Maritime Alps; he was hunted from his scattered, but ancient, strongholds in Southern Italy and Southern

France, whence he had for centuries been contemplating their conquest. A thousand Christian galleys on the Mediterranean and the Adriatic drove the corsairs of Africa to their distant lairs, and relieved the Christian people of the seaboard from the daily fear of slavery, their women from outrage, their children from ransom. This nameless horror of Moslem piracy, that has not yet finally disappeared, had paralyzed the Italian and French merchant, had suspended the natural free movement of peoples across the Mediterranean, was debasing the political sense of all the Christians of Southern Europe. In Visigothic Spain, the descendants of the Cid Campeador took heart once more. The good knight Roland had again arisen and from his last rock of defense had blown a strong blast that reëchoed over Europe. The Christian States of the Balkans (for if there is a Balkan question, it is owing to the failure of the Crusades), though ignorant and blind as to their welfare, got a long respite through the Crusades. Indeed, they put off entirely, if not political humiliation, at least any such complete assimilation into Islam as has fallen upon the Coptic race in Egypt. It is owing to the Crusades that the profound eternal antithesis and antipathy of the political ideals of East and West were brought out, precisely when the final adjustment of territorial limits was taking place. The great wars of Spain in the fifteenth century, that ended in the fall of Grenada, the great wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries between Hungary and Austria on the one side, and the Sultans at Constantinople on the other, are really Crusades. Thus, at the very threshold of modern times these wars were the last death struggle between Islam and Christianity over two great natural bulwarks of Europe the Pyrenees and the Danube. There is the most intimate relationship of cause and effect between the siege of Jerusalem and its capture, that ended the first Crusade, and the siege of Vienna, that six hundred years later immortalized John Sobieski and broke triumphantly the last effort of Islam to extend its propaganda over Europe. What will you have, O Christians! the immoral reign of fatalism with the hopeless human degradation of the Orient, or the uplifting reign of freedom with the general human progress and exaltation of the Occident? Our fathers before us, walking in a dimmer light, chose decisively and made the history that I have been outlining. If the citizens of the Pacific coast gaze out to-day, as the masters of the future over an illimitable Orient; if the evil genius that some grave historians consider the real Antichrist, enthroned by the Golden Horn, is now threatened from the depths of the Orient itself; if the latest phase of this eternal warfare between the ideals of the oldest strata of humanity and those of the youngest, opens with universal victory written on our banners, we may know

that the temper, the spirit, the weapons, the persistency that have uplifted us, were not created in a day, any more than the conditions of the Orient are the result of yesterday.

Never did the great French Catholic statesman, Montalembert, utter a truer word than when, fifty years ago, he cried out in the French Chamber of Deputies: "We are the sons of the Crusaders." Freeman has said that all history is only the politics of the past, the sure and real interests of mankind which have gotten crystallized by the shaping activity of the present that strikes, stamps, and returns no more. History is not always mere writing or telling—very often it is the real conditions, the institutions, the social framework and circumstance of our lives, the actual dwelling that our ancestors have made for us. The Crusades were the great political school of the people of Europe, as they passed from their crude ebullient youth to the maturity of man's estate.[1] It is not without design that Shakespeare, dealing in Richard the Second with the most profound problems of the English Constitution, sets down among the public merits of a great English noble his devotion to the political ideals of Christendom:

> Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
> For Jesu Christ in glorious Christian field
> Streaming the ensign of the Christian Cross
> Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens.

The Crusades developed in a humane sense the art of war. Captives were habitually ransomed for money that was gravely needed by both sides, as the real sinews of war; thus the wholesale slaughter of more barbarous times was avoided. The men of the West learned the light Parthian tactics of the Orient, also the daily exercises with bow and lance and sword, the details of commissariat and transportation, the cost and difficulties and consequences of a great war.

[1] The Crusades are not, in my mind, either the popular delusions that our cheap literature has determined them to be, nor papal conspiracies against kings and peoples, as they appear to the Protestant controversialists; nor the savage outbreak of expiring barbarism, thirsting for blood and plunder, nor volcanic explosions of religious tolerance. I believe them to have been in their deep sources, and in the minds of their best champions, and in the main tendency of their results, capable of ample justification. They were the first great effort of mediæval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambitions; they were the trial-feat of the young world, essaying to use, to the glory of God and the benefit of man, the arms of its new knighthood. That they failed in their direct object is only what may be alleged against almost every great design which the great disposer of events has moulded to help the world's progress; for the world has grown wise from the experience of failure, rather than by the winning of high aims. That the good they did was largely leavened with evil may be said of every war that had ever been waged; that bad men rose by them while good men fell, is, and must be true, wherever and whenever the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong. But that in the end they were a benefit to the world no one who reads can doubt; and that in their course they brought out a love for all that is heroic in human nature, the love of freedom, the honor of prowess, sympathy with sorrow, perseverance to the last, the chronicles of the age abundantly prove; proving, moreover, that it was by the experience of these times that the forms of those virtues were realized and presented to posterity.—Bishop Stubbs, "Seventeen Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History," p. 180.

Their weapons grew lighter, and their armor and horses more manageable. The ecclesiastic military orders, and the many European ladies of rank who followed their lords to the Sepulchre of Christ, introduced milder manners, and a humanity unknown to their earlier times. The sorrows and defeats of the Crusades, their humiliations and losses, were very often borne in a spirit of Christian faith, as a rebuke from God for their own wrong-doings and evil lives. The natural virtues of Islam, the courtesy and chivalry of its warriors, were not without their effect on the Christian knight. The legends of the Crusades are filled with figures of Moslems renowned for bravery and hospitality, gentleness and courtesy. A Richard Lion-Heart finds a Saladin his peer in many things.

The art of navigation profited very much by the Crusades—the vessels were made larger for the growing multitudes of pilgrims and warriors, for the transportation of horses and provisions. The masts and the sails were enlarged and were multiplied. The art of sailing by the wind was learned. Every such progress was a step towards the discovery of the new world. The skill of a Christopher Columbus was an inherited thing, acquired through the experience of several long generations of his ancestors in the service of Genoa.

We owe to the Crusades the use of the drum, the trumpet, the light and slender lance. The science of heraldry dates from that period, the Crusades, and though it may not contribute much to the comfort of humanity, it plays a prominent rôle in the development of the fine arts and of the social life of Europe in the last few centuries. Many fruit trees now common in the West were then introduced into Europe from Asia Minor, or the lowlands of Mesopotamia, their natural home. The apricot, the pear, the peach, the plum, trees and shrubs and flowers of uncommon beauty and elegance, made their way in this manner into the States of Europe. Some curious things found a new home for themselves; thus, the windmills that are so common yet in Holland and Brandenburg were imported from the Orient. Until the Crusades, no respectable man in Europe wore a beard—since then the observance of this civilized remnant of ancient society has been abandoned to the clergy. Healing recipes and plants of the Orient became the common property of the West. Medical theory and practice gained much by the study of Arabic writings that bore along the learning and experience of Greece. The hospital service at Jerusalem and elsewhere opened a new era in the history of Christian charity.

The cause of human freedom was greatly benefited by the Crusades. Knight and peasant fought side by side for many years, rendered mutual service, shared the same hardships, and learned to esteem one another. Thus, the theory of Christian equality was

daily reduced to reality. Then again, the knight needed ready money for his equipment, to pay off his creditors before departing, to provide for his family. He got it from his vassals, but before they paid it over, he was bound to secure them certain rights and privileges in solemn forms of writing. So arose on every estate of France and Germany free towns and cities, legally recognized by their former lords as independent and self-governing. Local and private feuds ceased to a great extent during the Crusades; there was a certain halo about the homes of those who were supposed to be bent on freeing the common home of all Christians. The national unities of France, England and Germany had then a chance to grow, unmolested by the earlier anarchy of primitive feudalism. The numerous serfs on the knights' estates became free peasants in time by service in the wars, or by purchase; at the other end of the state, the King entered at last upon the authority necessary to keep order and develop the common weal.

The mystery of the Orient, the long absences of the knights and their squires, the new strange romance of their lives, without parallel in the experience of the West, the curiosities of art and commerce that soon multiplied, gave a great impetus to the literatures of Europe—notably to poetry and song. The courtly troubadours and the gay Minnesinger are the creatures of the Crusades. The tournaments, the Courts of Love, the moderation and refining of personal manners, popular habits and institutions, all date from these great wars that furnished an infinity of data to the busy brain and the wagging tongue of many a strolling poet or musician from Otranto to Drontheim.

V.

Italy took little part, as a militant element, in the Crusades, partly because of its thorough disunion—partly because of its superior culture. The Italians soon saw that there was greater profit for them in the transportation of their Christian brethren, the care of the commissariat, and the establishment of commerce. After all, these were necessary things, and the great cities of Venice and Genoa were admirably located for the work as was also their rival Pisa. They enabled the Crusaders to cross the ocean quickly and successfully; they brought with them men skilled in the art of sieges; they were the secretaries and couriers of the French and German knights—supple, cautious, wiry, alert, very Christian indeed, but with a sharp eye for the goods of this world. They took out their pay in commercial privileges and are the genuine forerunners of all modern commerce. Along the coast of Syria and of Asia Minor,

from Smyrna to Beyrouth, there was in every port an Italian quarter. In the roadstead lay their galleys, high, broad, elegant for that day. In their special reservation were always a church, a bath, a bakery, wharves, stores, a market place, a bank and office of exchange. The Italian tongue was the tongue of Oriental commerce. Bookkeeping and the use of Arabic numerals, the system of drafts and bills of exchange, letters of credit and the like, sprang up on these foreign shores—the departing Templar or Hospitaller sold out his estate in Syria and received his money, his gold Bezants or Angels, over the counters of correspondents in Paris, London or Rome. The flag of Venice or Genoa or Pisa floated always over these little strongholds of commerce, that were long an abomination to the "malignant and turbaned Turk." From the remoter Orient came through the hands of the Italian merchant the silks of China, the spices of Borneo, the fruits of Asia Minor, the ivory and pearls of India. His correspondents were at Naples and Milan and Florence, at Marseilles and Bordeaux, at London and Paris, at Kieff and Novgorod. Oranges and figs, sugar and wine and oil, brocades and muslins, fine tapestries and costly rugs, colored glass of Tyre and steel blades of Damascus—a thousand articles of use and ornament, could be met with upon his manifests. And so the city life of Europe took on a charm, an elegance, a variety that it had never known before. The middle classes date from those days—the opulent tradesman and the cultured merchant, the skilled laborer and the substantial banker. The turbulent republics of Italy, the first great temple of democracy since the overthrow of Athens and Sparta, arose on this trade, and by their wealth defied emperor and baron, by their wealth permitted themselves the expensive luxury of yearly constitutions, wholesale proscriptions, political experiments without number. The common man had now a hundred avenues of opportunity open to him, of escape from a hemming and stifling feudalism, of elevation into a higher and more independent sphere of energy. The monotonous life of the remote castle took on color and variety. Everywhere the vivifying current of commerce cut a channel for itself. European mankind had burst the bonds of its swaddling clothes, saw and measured with eagerness the great world, and recognized the fulness and glory of its new opportunities.

The first progress of mediæval medicine and constitutional law is closely related to these great movements of mankind to the East. Out of them came the first conscious lay attempts at a civil government based on written law—the feudal states of Syria. Almost the first written codes of mediæval law are the Assizes of Jerusalem, a formally excogitated and guaranteed legislation for all classes. Commercial law that had made little progress since the code of Amalfi,

was reduced to writing and to a system. Maritime and military law, the old imperial traditions and the valuable experience of Constantinople, asserted themselves—in a word, the Crusades were the first great school of general and common civilized life for all the nations of Europe.[2]

Not only did they increase the knowledge of the world and widen the horizon of learning—they brought out very high qualities of moral life. Personality asserted itself very strongly, given the weakness of authority and the countless new perils of these enterprises. If monk and priest were zealous and eloquent, the baron and his men were heroic and enduring. A new public consciousness was aroused, and there dawned on the humblest mind the possibility of what a united Christendom could do. Nations were drawn together very closely, in their own ranks first, and then between one another. Europe had never before been solidary in any enterprise. The wealth and elegance of Moslem society impressed the Crusaders, as also did the polish and culture of Constantinople and its Greek society. One was infidel and the other schismatic, yet daily contact with both begot more liberal and tolerant relations. The elements of common humanity asserted themselves in diplomacy and hospitality, in ransom and truce and single combat; the courteous and enlightened toleration of modern society is all in germ in the mediæval Crusades. Men hate one another, says Silvio Pellico, only because they do not know one another.

[2] It used to be the fashion to regard the Crusades as mere fantastic exhibitions of a temporary turbulent religious fanaticism, aiming at ends wholly visionary, and missing them, wasting the best life of Europe in colossal and bloody undertakings, and leaving effects only of evil for the time which came after. More reasonable views now prevail; and while the impulse in which the vast movement took its rise is recognized as passionate and semi-barbaric, it is seen that many effects followed which were beneficent rather than harmful, which could not perhaps have been at the time in other ways realized. As I have already suggested, properties were to an important extent redistributed in Europe, and the constitution of states was favorably effected. Lands were sold at low prices by those who were going on the distant expeditions, very probably, as they knew, never to return; and horses and armor, with all martial equipments, were bought at high prices by those who were to need them on the march and in battle. Even the Jews who could not hold land, and the history of whom throughout the Middle Ages is commonly to be traced in fearful lines of blood and fire, increased immeasurably their movable wealth through these transfers of property. Communes bought liberties by large contributions to the needs of their lord; and their liberties once secured, were naturally confirmed and augmented, as the years went on. The smaller tended to be absorbed in the larger; the larger often to come more strictly under royal control, thus increasing the power of the sovereign—which meant at the time, general laws, instead of local, a less minutely oppressive administration, the furtherance of the movement toward national unity. It is a noticeable fact that Italy took but a small part, comparatively, in the Crusades; and the long postponement of organic unions between different parts of the magnificent peninsula is not without relation to this. The influence which operated elsewhere in Europe to efface distinctions of custom and language in separate communities, to override and extinguish local animosities, to make scattered peoples conscious of kinship, did not operate there; and the persistent severance of sections from each other, favored of course by the run of the rivers and the vast separating walls of the Apennines, was the natural consequence of the want of this powerful unifying force.—Storrs, "Bernard of Clairvaux," New York (Scribner's), 1897, pp. 544-45.

In these two centuries, therefore, the world of Europe expanded mightily and organically. The once barbarian Germanic people, educated in their infancy by the Catholic Church, broke the bonds of serf-like dependency, cast aside their primitive narrow feudalism and could in time become the great states of Europe. They went forth, sword in hand, across land and sea, in pursuit of a high spiritual ideal, and while they did not realize it, nevertheless it drew them like a star, to great heights of personal endeavor and social achievement. Fine qualities of mind and heart were developed in these enterprises that partook at once of the conquests of an Alexander and the results of Colonization. The cycle of social life was immeasurably enlarged. Politeness established its reign with the elevation of woman, that came through the church, and the institutions of chivalry. The arts and sciences of the Greek Orient and the Moslem world, were made known to Europe. Literature found new models, new ideals and aspirations; the singers of the people new notes, new themes, new passions. Industry and commerce were admitted as factors in the new States of Europe and the Orient. All the factors that were to bring about the creation of modern society, with the exception of the latest inventions, were then planted on the soil of Europe. Unity, assimilation, progress, go back to these great displacements of European humanity. No doubt there was much injustice, much crime and human folly—but wars have their civilizing and humanizing functions, as well as peace. They are often unavoidable and they have their allotted place in the divine plan that surely governs the world of men and things. Though we may never again see a United Christendom, it will always be a consolation to every adorer of Jesus Christ that for one brief hour in the history of Western humanity His Cross dominated all social life, drew to it every class of men, shone resplendent and humanizing in the zenith of public life, affected all legislation and human development, impressed its spiritual meaning on millions of hearts, and seemed like the holy aurora of the long sighed for millenium.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

CATHOLIC DEMOCRACY.

I HAVE not chosen the title of Professor Nitti's interesting work on "Catholic Socialism"[1] to designate the important movement among Catholics on the Continent of which it treats—the attempt to deal on Christian principles with the abuses of modern capitalism, and the grievances of the laboring classes. The name "Catholic Socialism" is really misleading; for opposition to the principles of continental Socialism is a main feature of the programme in most cases. Still, the fact that the movement of which I am going to speak has strenuously opposed the extreme individualism of the liberal economics explains, if it does not justify, Professor Nitti's use of the term. I propose to give an outline of the Catholic social movement in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria, and briefly to consider some of the principles it has involved, and the action of Leo the Thirteenth in its regard. Besides Professor Nitti's work I shall avail myself of Grégoire's *Le Pape, les Catholiques et la Question sociale*, and of various fugitive essays and papers by recent students of the question.[2]

In France the movement has been, and still is, associated closely with the name of Count Albert de Mun. Together with his friend La Tour du Pin Chambly, Comte de Mun was taken prisoner during the war of 1870. During their captivity the two friends read together Emile Keller's work on the Encyclical of 1864 and the principles of 1789. This encyclical, which was published with the Syllabus, was, as we remember, mainly a protest against the revolutionary principles adopted by modern society, and the indiscriminate Liberalism which was the gospel of the civilized world at that time. Pius the Ninth protested in both documents against the exaggerated *cultus* of the modern "liberties," and maintained that true liberty was to be found, not in unrestricted freedom for the individual, but in wise protective legislation by Church and State for the general good of society. At a time when free trade, free speech, free association, a free press, free contract, the automatic working of the laws of supply and demand, were regarded as the panacea for all evils, this protest was received by the irreligious press as the supreme act of dotage on the part of the Papacy, and its final divorce from the modern world. De Mun was not in love with the modern world. He and his friend returned to France in '71 and helped to put down

[1] "Catholic Socialism," by Francesco S. Nitti, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Naples. Translated, with an introduction, by Professor David G. Ritchie. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London, 1895.

[2] I may name especially some valuable private notes by Mr. C. S. Devas on some aspects of the movement in France and Germany.

the Commune. They saw in the Commune an object lesson in the results of the principles of the Revolution. The conservative reaction which led Frenchmen to welcome the Marshalate, took an acute and special form in Albert de Mun. The spectacles of carnage and starvation which the Commune presented, gave him at once deep sympathy with the oppressed, and a strong sense that revolutionary principles led to a form of that very tyranny against which the Revolution had protested. A born philanthropist, Albert de Mun found himself on Christmas night 1871 discussing the question of the hour at a workman's club founded by M. Maignan. Then and there they decided to extend the institution. Its object was that workmen should themselves study the social question under the *ægis* of religion and wise direction; that they should avoid a repetition of the awful irony of the Revolution, of success in securing a remedy which led back to a new form of the disease. The Utopian hopes which had been dissipated by the Commune, were to be replaced by aiming at a system which would at least secure religion and order—a monarchy which had learnt its lesson and would respect the just claims of the working classes. Royalism and the extreme Ultramontanism of the Syllabus seem at first sight to have little in common with a democratic movement; yet they were the inspiring motives of Albert de Mun's *Œuvre des cercles*, the first-fruits of the modern Catholic democracy in France.

In ten years, according to the testimony of Mr. Kaufman, the clubs belonging to the *Œuvre* movement had reached the number of 450, and it was decided to admit to membership besides workmen themselves, others who subscribed to the programme of the institution. While the *Œuvre* extended itself, its economic programme gradually became more thorough and definite. Its council devoted itself to serious study, the results of which were published periodically in its organ, *L'Association catholique;* and such a non-Catholic economical authority as M. Benedict, the Socialist, in the *Revue socialiste* of 1885, recognized emphatically the value of its contributions to the problem. It should be added that the *Œuvre* did not continue to be royalist in its aspirations, and eventually "rallied" to the Republic.

More venturesome economic speculations led to some discontent with the limited results of the *Œuvre*. De Mun came to advocate a total restoration of something like the old Guild system. In March 1884 he helped in passing a Bill that, for the first time in the present century, allowed liberty to workmen's associations. But De Mun's proposals to give them special privileges were rejected, and, in fact, they have developed slowly and their members number only 3 per cent. of the million Frenchmen now joined in syndicates of which the

two chief and rapidly growing forms, each with between four and five hundred thousand members, are the *syndicats ouvriers*, or trades unions, that may be well regarded with anxiety, and the *syndicats agricoles*, or rural associations, that may be well regarded with satisfaction. In 1888 de Mun proposed a scheme of State intervention so elaborate that Mgr. Freppel (Bishop of Angers), who had supported the Bill of 1884, drew back, saying that he would have neither State Socialism nor Church Socialism.

The origin of the Catholic democratic movement in Switzerland presents points of marked contrast with France. The French movement was instituted by a nobleman, the Swiss by a man of the people, Dr. Gaspard Decurtins. De Mun was a man of action before he became a student; a religious student before he became an economist or a popular leader. Decurtins began his studies at seventeen, read the fathers and the Socialists; and emerged from his reading a devout Catholic, and an implacable enemy of the liberal economic principles, before he became a man of action at all. Again, from his antecedents and character he had the power of winning the confidence of a popular audience. De Mun's best speeches (it was said) were those which ended with the words, "go to the people;" but actually to go to them and to influence them was the office for which Decurtins was especially fitted. De Mun's *Œuvre*, mroeover, was confined to Catholics. Decurtins, living in a country where creeds are divided, worked in company with Protestants. De Mun's actual achievement was most successful in the formation of workmen's clubs and corporations. He effected comparatively little in the direction of legislation. Decurtins, on the contrary, achieved most in actual remedial legislation, and in enabling the workman to gain the ear of the Government for his grievances. "In no country," says M. Grégoire, "has legislation on behalf of the workman advanced so rapidly as in Switzerland," and to the initiative of Decurtins that legislation was largely due. He instituted, in concert with more advanced Socialists, the *Secretariat ouvrier*, an office of statistics, whose officials are elected by the workingmen's societies, and which acts as intermediary between the Government and the laboring classes—laying before the Executive their grievances and their complaints against public functionaries. Those who wish to know the exact scope of the legislation on behalf of the laborer in Switzerland should consult the work of M. Gay, *La legislation ouvriere en Suisse*.

It was Decurtins who first successfully conceived the plan of international action on the social question, to be inaugurated with the approval of the various European Governments. In 1887 he broached the question in the Swiss Parliament. In 1888 the Par-

liament ratified his proposal. An International Congress was fixed to take place at Berne in the following year. By Emperor William's desire it was transferred to Berlin. If the Congress did not decide much, it inaugurated a movement. It marked the recognition by the various States represented, of the principle of international action and legislation on the labor question. It was succeeded by others. At a subsequent Congress at Bienne in 1893 Decurtins won another point in the direction of gaining the sanction of religion and authority for the international movement. A mixed assemblage of members, of different nationalities and of many creeds and no creed, passed a resolution in favor of Leo the Thirteenth's encyclical on the labor question—the *Rerum novarum*—and obtained from the Pope a letter addressed to Decurtins (dated August 6, 1893), in which, though silent as to the extent of State interference desirable, he favored the genral idea of international legislation on behalf of the workman.

The action of Pope and Emperor in favor of international legislation on the social question leads me naturally to consider the history of the Catholic democratic movement in Germany itself. With the work of Bishop Ketteler in the fifties, in arousing from his pulpit at Mainz a sense of the reality of the social problem and of the hardships of the workingman, my readers are probably familiar. He was the great pioneer. The men of the German Centre who developed the movement—Canons Moufang and Hitze—received their impulse from Ketteler. The story of its progress runs parallel to the story of Bismarck's war to the knife with what he used to term the "black international" and the "red international."

The "red international" was Bismarck's name for modern Socialism. The "black international" was the Catholic and Roman Church. Both these two powers were at one time or another objects of his relentless hostility. The Catholic population of the German Empire is not much more (according to Réclus) than one-half the Protestant population. But German Catholicism has been singularly vigorous since the great revival which dates from 1837. After Bismarck's determined attempt to break its power by the Falk laws of 1873, he came in the end to think that the "red international" was a greater danger to the State than the "black;" that the friendship of the "black" was necessary for effective opposition to the "red." With the courage of a really strong man Bismarck promptly translated his changed convictions into action. The policy of the Kulturkampf was reversed. His saying, "We are not going to Canossa," was no longer insisted on. The Falk laws were one after another repealed.

It was in 1878 that this change in Bismarck's policy became in-

evitable. Socialism had been assuming a more menacing aspect for upwards of a year, and in May and June came the two attempts, of Hodel and Nobiling, to assassinate the Emperor. A month later saw the general elections, and the Catholic Centre not only came in in increased numbers, but the whole compact party of National Liberals was broken up into almost equal groups of Imperialists and National Liberals. The Catholics held the balance of power and were masters of the situation. They had steadily gained in popularity among the masses, largely owing to their democratic programme, of which Ketteler's disciple, Canon Moufang, was at that time the most influential exponent. And now it was clear that instead of breaking their power, the Falk laws had increased it; while instead of being the natural allies of the Government, which was trembling in fear of a revolution, they were, by the Government's own persistent persecution, its avowed enemies.

Meanwhile a new Pope had come, free from the specially bitter personal memories which had led Pius the Ninth to an irreversible policy of *Non possumus*. Bismarck approached Leo the Thirteenth in 1879 on the subject of a modification of the Falk laws. Nothing seemed to come of it. But in February 1880, the Pope publicly urged the Archbishop of Cologne to submit the names of priests to Government before instituting them. The new importance of the Catholic vote in the Reichstag was an additional motive for prompt acceptance of the Pope's olive branch. The Falk laws were modified in the same year. Further modifications followed in 1883 and 1884; and in 1885 came the interesting spectacle of the Protestant Chancellor inviting the Pope to assume the mediæval rôle of international arbiter between Spain and Germany in the dispute about the Caroline Islands. The islands were awarded to Spain with the due protection of German interests, and the order of Christ was bestowed on Prince Bismarck.

This sequence of events was closely allied with the progress of the Catholic democratic movement in Germany. As early as 1871—before the passing of the Falk laws—Baron von Schorlemer Alst had so far organized his Westphalian Bauernverein—an association of landholders, large and small—that they used their newly won franchise with great effect against the Government candidates, and the association was forcibly dissolved by Bismarck. It was, however, reconstituted under a new name. And in the critical years between the passing of the Falk laws in 1873 and the Socialist attempts on the Emperor's life in 1878, the popular programme of the Catholic party was one great secret of its strength. "Thanks to its social programme," writes M. Grégoire, "the centre party was able to maintain its struggle with the Government. When, on the other

hand, Socialism became in Germany the great subject of alarm, the Government naturally made approaches to the Centre, which alone, thanks to the same programme, was able to resist Socialism with some chance of success."[3]

Now, it is important to note that in Germany, and still more in Austria, the Catholic democratic movement was not a popular one in the same sense as it was in Switzerland and in France, and largely in Belgium and in America. Both in Germany and in Austria the mediæval guilds had only recently been deprived of their privileges —by the laws of 1868 in Prussia and of 1871 in Germany; while in Austria they had been abolished in 1859. Again the special class antagonism in Germany and Austria was not that hatred of the old aristocracy, which had been so potent among French working men at the time of the Revolution; but a hatred, in which many noblemen were united with the people, of the modern plutocracy as represented by the Jews. The movement was largely anti-Semitic.

Of practical workers among the people none have been more active or effectual than Baron von Schorlemer Alst, already alluded to as founder of the Westphalian Bauernverein. This great association grew in 1868 out of a number of smaller ones, each founded by a landed proprietor or large farmer. Baron Felix von Loe in 1877 instituted a society of popular economy. This was in 1882 transformed into the Rheinische Bauernverein, which, like the Westphalian, numbers over 20,000 members.

There are also Bavarian Bauernvereine numbering 12,000 members in 1895, Silesian, 8,500; in Nassau over 3,000; in Baden 4,000; and others in Arn and the Eichsfeld district.

The general condition of membership in these associations is twofold: first to be a landholder, whether large proprietor, yeoman, peasant, or tenant farmer; and secondly to be a good Christian. The Lutheran farmers, therefore, are equally admissible with the Catholics; still, it is principally the Catholic districts of Germany that are the seats of the Bauernvereine. The work done is of many kinds, for example, insurance against fire and hail, life insurance, joint purchase of artificial manures and agricultural machinery, joint sale of agricultural produce, coöperative savings banks and lending banks on the Raiffeisen principle, spread of information useful to farmers by means of the newspaper of the association, prevention of disputes by a board of conciliation, and legal advice and support.

Not less important than these rural societies are those for town workers, which have grown up *pari passu* with the transformation of the old ways of industry. The first was to meet the needs of a class, still important in Germany, the *Gesellen* or journeymen, young men

[3] "Grégoire, pp. 10, 11.

from the age of seventeen onwards, who had finished their apprenticeship and were traveling, as the custom was, through Germany, to grow perfect in their trade, staying longer or shorter at different places according to circumstances. The old bonds having been broken by which the masters in *la petite industrie* were almost like fathers to their journeymen, the demoralization of the latter was great, until Father Kolping, who had himself in his youth been a journeyman tailor, founded at Elberfeld in 1846 the admirable Gesellenvereine, providing these young workmen with a decent home, decent companions and recreation, education, religious, general and technical, information enabling them to obtain work, help in distress, and means to reach another town where a similar centre and home would be found. At Kolping's death in 1865 these associations had spread over Germany and had become the model for analogous institutions among the Protestants. At present in the German Empire the members of the Catholic Gesellenvereine number some 75,000.

But other classes of workpeople were growing in importance and were not provided for by the journeymen's associations. Hence, in the sixties, a number of Catholic associations grew up under various names, often taking the Gesellenvereine as their model. A great development and union of these seemed imminent in 1869 after the Bishops' Conference at Fulda and under the leadership of Von Ketteler, the bishop of Mayence. But this development was arrested by the Falk laws, and not until they had been abrogated could it be resumed. Thenceforth the interrupted work of Catholic association has gone rapidly forward. The "Union of Catholic Manufacturers and Friends of the Workpeople" was founded in 1881 under the title of Arbeiterwohl, with an admirable journal of the same name; Franz Brandt being president, and Abbé Hitze, the able democratic member of the Reichstag, secretary. The members bind themselves to promote the good of the workingman, and respect his interests. Claudio Jannet could well speak of it as one of the great forces of Catholic Germany. This association among the upper classes has fostered the growth of associations among the workpeople, till now in the German Empire there are some 300 of them under the title of Catholic Workmen's Unions (Katholische Arbeitervereine) with some 80,000 members, quite distinct from the Gesellenvereine already mentioned, as well as from other Catholic associations for working boys and apprentices, factory girls, shop women, and domestic servants.

It would carry me too far to describe the efforts of the two priests, Moufang and Hitze, in the Reichstag to plead the cause of the workingman. The aim of Hitze was the social organization of

trades by means of compulsory industrial corporations—a far wider and more revolutionary conception than the Catholic corporations already in existence. Free Catholic corporations, or at most free corporations of mixed confessions, were all that was contemplated as possible by such moderate members of the Centre as Windhorst. Hitze worked so successfully that in 1888 several important Bills for the protection of labor and in the direction of State organization of industry passed the Reichstag. A panic ensued in the manufacturing class, and the measures were bodily rejected by the Bundesrath. Hitze, however—whom the fall of Bismarck and the death of Windhorst, the head of the Centre party, made a very prominent person in the Reichstag—has continued to urge his ideas on his fellow countrymen, and has been made by the present Emperor a member of the Council of the State.

But the Christian democrats of Germany originated a yet more potent movement among their neighbors in Austria. In the year in which Bismarck's alarm at the growth of Socialism was first aroused—1877—Dr. Rudolph Meyer, a Prussian, published a work called *Politische Gründe und die Corruption in Deutschland.* His work was an outspoken attack on the Government, and Meyer was forced to fly the country. He fled to Austria and became one of the founders of the Catholic democratic movement there, though he himself remained a Protestant. Another Prussian, Baron Karl von Vogelsang, converted in early years to Catholicism, was a yet more influential leader in Austria.

In Austria the movement was, as I have already said, essentially anti-Semitic, and feudal and aristocratic in its ideal, and in the persons of its promoters. Anti-Semitism is a powerful force in Germany; but in Austria it became something like a passion or a panic. The Jews in Austria and Hungary enjoy an almost exclusive monopoly of industrial revenue. The press, the banks, the Stock Exchange are in their hands. They hold themselves apart from the rest of the population. Their gradual absorption of economic territory has been accompanied by a growth in numbers. Professor Nitti estimates that between 1869 and 1888—a period of nineteen years—they increased at the rate of 27 per cent., while the rest of the population has increased only at the rate of 77 per cent. Territorially also their power has steadily increased. The Rothschilds alone possess a fourth part of the Bohemian territory, *i. e.* seven times more than the Imperial family. It is maintained that this increase of wealth and power on the part of the Jews has not been accompanied by any attempt on their part to improve the condition of the laboring classes. A recent inquiry has shown that throughout the empire the workmen are treated with special severity and exploited with avidity by the Jewish inhabitants and proprietors.

Naturally on many grounds the growth of Jewish influence was unwelcome to the clergy. Thus, the people, many of the old aristocracy—whose wealth and influence were being usurped—and the clergy, have been united in hatred of the Jews. It is easy, then, to understand that a movement against the encroachments of these hated capitalists was taken up with keenness and energy.

Vogelsang, who achieved such marked success in the movement, urged his ideas in the journal called the *Vaterland* and in his own paper *Monatschrift für christliche social Reform.* His point of departure was opposition to the liberalism of the Revolution of '48, which had done for Austria what the great Revolution did for France. The comparative recency of the Revolution gave force to his claim that his programme was essentially conservative, having for its aim the restoration of the feudal principles displaced in 1848. He maintained that the old order rested on the principle that property was given to individuals in exchange for their performance of certain duties to the community. The King himself held his territory and received homage in consideration of the performance of his duties as legislator for the common good, and as the representative of his country in its international relations. The old feudal nobility supplied soldiers for a war; were guardians of order in their own district; protected the interests of their own tenants. The old guilds organized the various trades and protected the interests of the craftsman. These institutions had gradually degenerated, and the sentiment of rights had replaced that of duties. But instead of effecting the desired reform—of enforcing by law duties which those in high station had come to neglect—the Revolution simply dissolved the social organism, and substituted for the old collection of more or less autonomous bodies an omnipotent State bureaucracy. It left the real evil untouched; and private property continued to be a luxury entailing no duties whatever, and benefiting only its possessor. The Revolution was the abolition of the old order and the triumph of the bureaucracy and of capitalism. Industry, instead of tending towards national prosperity, now subserved the interests only of the capitalists. The remedy must lie in the revival of the old feudal relations between the upper classes and their dependents, and the reëstablishment of something like the old guilds on a solid foundation as a check on the tyranny of capitalism. These corporations were to be autonomous bodies with legal and personal rights, and under the supervision of the State.

Vogelsang and his friends urged this programme by two methods —in Parliament and by Catholic congresses. Prince Lichtenstein was their principal spokesman in the Reichstag. Their first great victory in Parliament was the passing of the Bill in 1883 restoring

the corporations of trades in Austria, so far as the *petite industrie* was concerned, with further license to restore the district corporations of large industries. In 1884 a similar measure was passed in reference to Hungary. In March 1885 a law was enacted fixing eleven hours as a maximum day's work, and limiting the labor of women and children.

The work of restoring and reorganizing the corporations in the end proved slow and difficult. It was promoted by successive congresses, notably by that of 1890, in which twenty-three bishops and 600 priests took part. The Jesuit, Father Kolb, the Dominican Father, Albert Weiss, and Herr Eichorn, a priest and a deputy in the Reichstag, have been among the most vigorous workers. Among the members of the old aristocracy who have followed Baron Vogelsang's lead are, besides Prince Lichtenstein already mentioned, Count Blöme, Count Kuefstein, and Count Belcredi.

It should be added that, although the Catholic Popular party has perhaps more nearly approached socialistic principles in Austria than elsewhere, Vogelsang very strongly opposed any movement in the direction of land-nationalization. "However advanced my conceptions may appear," he said, "they have no other basis but the old Christian civilization of the Western races. I am the declared enemy of the all-powerfulness of the State, of the Byzantine smothering of every liberty, of all intellectual life which would result from Nationalization of the land." But he added emphatically that the intervention of the Church was not enough without that of the State and of Christian laws.

John Stuart Mill, in a posthumous fragment on Socialism, remarked that whereas all Socialist writers were more or less agreed as to the social evils which they wished to see remedied, scarcely any two of them could agree as to the proposed remedy. The same remark applies to the Catholic social movement.

It will be, however, possible to classify certain solutions proposed; and from the classification some useful results may be obtained.

The most thorough and philosophical basis for the whole movement was supplied by a man who was also historically one of its originators in France and Belgium, M. Leplay. A disciple of Bonald, who, with De Maistre, was one of the founders of the modern French Ultramontane school, he developed Bonald's philosophy on that side which relates to the social problem. Bonald had severely criticized the individualism of the eighteenth-century sceptics. He appealed to the universal immemorial beliefs of society as embodying both the primitive revelation and the experience of the race—to customs and traditions having that claim to authority which consisted in the fact that they had kept society together in the past. He justified religious faith against the negative criticism of

the individual sceptic on this ground. Leplay took up a similar position in the department where it was logically strongest—on purely social questions. Those conditions which were found by the experience of mankind to have actually led to social order and prosperity are thereby justified. But, with more caution than Bonald, he based his argument on a strictly inductive scientific process. Such speculations as those of St. Simon were, he maintained, mere exercises of the imagination. Theories like his, if carried out, were daring experiments on the body politic; and the results of an unsuccessful experiment were too awful for a wise statesman to risk. What was the issue of 1793 but the outcome of acting out hitherto untested social theories? Rather it behooves us, he maintained, by the strictly inductive method to study forms of society now existing and existing in the past, and from such observation to ascertain the causes of actual economic and social prosperity on the one hand and disaster on the other. In his travels as Professor of Metallurgy in the French University, as general inspector of mines, and in other departments, he had ample opportunities for observation. The accuracy of his personal observation is generally considered to be greater than the accuracy of his generalizations from history. He was deeply impressed by the fact that candid and close observation shows that at every turn the success of social experiments hinges on religion. "Social science," he writes, "leads its true observers constantly back to the principles of the Divine law." Though a Catholic, he was not, when he wrote his great work *La Reforme sociale*, closely associated with the Clerical party. He dwells more on the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount as forces to be applied in solving the social problem than on the work of the existing ecclesiastical organizations. Towards the end of his life, however, he wrote a letter of filial devotion to Leo the Thirteenth.

His studies appear to have convinced him that the subtle causes at work in social life could not be wholly reduced to an exact science. His advocacy of *patronat libre*—the voluntary exercise of the patriarchal virtues on the part of employers and landowners—as the best solution of the problem is an instance of this fact. It was largely an appeal to personal wisdom and benevolence rather than to a scientifically defined method. So, too, with his doctrine of "social authorities" and the "hierarchy of authorities." Those who had proved actually successful in organizing happy and prosperous communities became "authorities." Their methods should be imitated. They had the force of an empirical law, where the final conditions of success could not be fully traced. He called his theory the theory of "imitation," as distinguished from the theories of "invention" characteristic of modern Socialism. Such theories are utterly reck-

less, in the department of social science, of that law of induction—of ascertaining causes from observation of actual facts and experienced results—which has been one secret of success in physical science.

He advocates, then, the introduction into social science of some of the methods of physical science. But there is one important exception. Whereas constant experiment is an additional factor of importance in physical research—for if an experiment fails no harm is done, if it succeeds it means a step forward—he reiterates what Bonald had already said, that a rash experiment may be fatal in the social order. It may break up the existing organism of society, which cannot afterwards be pieced together again.

It is, then, the actual carrying into action of those conditions and dispositions which have made industrious, thrifty, and happy communities in the past, which will lead to social progress. It is not the discovery of new principles, but the selection of those old ones which have actually succeeded, and the carrying them systematically into action, that is wanted. "La réforme des mœurs n'est point subordonnée à l'invention de nouvelles doctrines," he writes, "car l'esprit de l'innovation est aussi stérile dans l'ordre moral qu'il est fécond dans l'ordre matériel."

Leplay thus regarded the problem as wholly a moral problem. The "patron" or employer has, according to him, lost the old Christian conception of his position. This is the root of the evil. If the idea of family life died out and children were generally ill-treated, starved, left in ignorance by their parents, you could not satisfactorily remedy the evil by legislation. No law elastic or subtle enough to match the loving care of a rightly disposed father and mother could be found. The remedy would lie in restoring to parents the lost sentiment of parental duty. So the remedy for the Labor difficulty lies in restoring the idea of the duties of the *patron*.

Those who developed Leplay's views in various directions laid perhaps greater stress than he did on the economic side of the question. And they acted in closer union with ecclesiastical authority. They were for the most part strong opponents of the Liberal economics. They argued against the fatalistic worship of freedom on the part of Liberals which led even our own John Bright to oppose the Factory Acts. Free contract between the wealthy and the starving, and free competition between the strong and the weak, were, they held, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the promised golden age which all the freedoms were to bring. Some social force to protect the helpless laborer—an impotent unit at the mercy of the capitalist—must be devised. So far there was agreement. But what force? Here began disagreement.

Some form of corporation was advocated by all. That corpora-

tions were to be largely under the influence of religion and the guidance of the Church—this again was a unanimous opinion.

But the specification of particulars led to divisions. Are the corporations to consist of workmen only, like our own trades unions, or are employers and workmen to combine? Are the organizations to be voluntary or enforced by law? Are they to be of Catholics only, or is each trade to form an industrial corporation of all its members, Catholic and non-Catholic alike? Are they to agitate forthwith for Labor laws? for State regulation of a minimum wage and a maximum day's work? for the Sunday rest? for the protection of women and children workers? Is the law to interfere in the regulation of the various industries? Is the State to regulate distribution? Here are some of the questions on which there seems hopeless variety of opinion, though perhaps the variety is in some cases more in appearance than in reality.

The most thorough-going and drastic policy has been adopted by the Catholics of Austria. Meyer's programme aimed at the State regulation of distribution and of industrial production, with a view to the collective interests of society; a minimum wage and maximum day; the establishment of State coöperative stores. In the region of practical politics Baron Vogelsang worked to secure compulsory industrial corporations. The Catholic party, under his guidance, have been drawing out a programme which would make fundamental changes in the Constitution. They carried, as we have seen, in 1883, a law which, under the plea for a conservative revival of the old guilds, introduced compulsory corporation in the *petite industrie;* and they proposed a change in the system of parliamentary representation which should ensure direct representation in Parliament of the various industrial interests. Count Blöme, in his speech at the Jubilee of Baron Vogelsang in 1888, drew a picture of the Reichstag of the future, where "we should no longer speak as at present of the member for Vienna, but the member for the *petite industrie* at Vienna, and the member for the Bourse at Vienna." The new corporations necessarily include Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Their establishment was an infraction of individual liberty on the part of the State, which made many Catholics fear that the thin end of the wedge of State Socialism was being introduced. Vogelsang and his friends also succeeded in obtaining important laws protecting the workmen, and they joined Decurtins in Switzerland in his advocacy of international legislation on the labor question.

At the opposite pole stands M. Léon Harmel, at the Val des Bois in Champagne. A practical man, himself a large employer of labor, he has advocated and carried out successfully a system of corpora-

tion based fundamentally on religious influences, voluntary in its origin, composed exclusively of Catholics, independent of State interference, claiming only a minimum of State recognition and support. Although he attaches more value to organization than Leplay does, he agrees with Leplay largely in believing that the necessary machinery is dependant at any time on certain moral dispositions and moral causes.

And in Leplay's "hierarchy of authorities" Harmel, from his marked success, should hold a high position. At the root of his whole system is the view that only community of aim among masters and men can make an experiment successful, and that that aim can only be obtained by the active application of religious principle. In the following remarkable passages he condemns beforehand as impracticable the far-reaching scheme of compulsory guilds made up of persons of all creeds.

> We will not on any account accept the compulsory guilds [he wrote in the *Association catholique des Patrons du Nord*], because the combining of unequal and frequently opposed elements can only, from the moral point of view, produce disastrous effects. Those who would build in company must first of all speak the same language. Now, Catholics and freethinkers have an entirely different language: the first call honor that which the others term cowardice, the second call liberty what the others consider as slavery; the former are ready to give their life for their duty, while the latter hold rebellion as the first of duties. On all arguments concerning virtue, probity, disinterestedness, the origin and aim of life, they each speak a separate language. How, then, could they act in concert in reconstructing a moral fabric which demands unity and community of effect?

Again, he writes in his *Manuel d'une Corporation chrétienne:*

> The social question is not only a question of food, clothing and lodging; it is above all a question of peace of heart. What matters most is not that the workman be richer or poorer, but that he be content with his lot. And while we see social peace reigning in localities where the wages are at the lowest rate, agitation and discontent frequently give rise to conflicts among populations enjoying much higher wages.

Harmel's scheme—of which I say no more, as its general features are well known—has found many imitators. And his corporation is affiliated to the Comte de Mun's *Œuvre des cercles.*

Between the Austrian extreme of compulsory guilds comprising members of the different religious confessions, and Harmel's free Catholic corporations, suggestive of the all-pervading religious life of mediæval times, there are many intermediate schemes more or less fully realized.

What has been Leo the Thirteenth's attitude in view of all these currents of opinion? It cannot be doubted that Leo the Thirteenth has long had a special sympathy with all active endeavor to improve the condition of the working man, provided such endeavor is not subversive of social order, and that he regards the modern tyranny of the capitalist as revolting to the sense of justice, and not as a necessary evil. In a remarkable pastoral written in 1877, before he

was Pope, he spoke bitterly of the modern capitalist who regarded his workman as a "machine," and maintained that the abuses in question which claimed to be a part of modern "progress" were in reality "driving us many centuries back to those sad times when so great a part of the human race lay crushed in slavery, and of which the poet sorrowfully cried, "The human race lives only in a few" (*"Humanum paucis vivit genus"*).

That very year the Pontiff was reminded that action on behalf of the suffering was rendered most difficult by the programme of the Nihilistic Socialists. The assassination of King Humbert and the attempt on the life of Emperor William, the rise of Nihilistic societies in Italy, with such names as La Mano Nera, La Dinamita, Morte ai Borghesi, meant the growth of an anarchic spirit which would make the best economic reforms useless, and any attempts to change the established order dangerous. The Encyclical of 1878 denounced Socialism in the strongest terms.

However, time went on and the danger lessened. The Catholic democratic movement, which I have sketched, took form in Switzerland and in Austria in the succeeding years. In France and Germany it grew in influence at the same time. It sent its addresses of deep loyalty to the Holy See. In response came sympathetic though guarded expressions of approval, until in 1891 the *Rerum novarum* gave a full statement of the Holy Father's position.

We know that the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, though it unquestionably shows his deep interest in the labor question, has been claimed as justifying their own views by both extreme parties—the democrats and the advocates of the existing order, who would invoke no remedy beyond an exhortation to philanthropy and almsgiving. The text of the encyclical is before every one, and to examine to any purpose the disputed passages would carry me too far.

But to my mind the lessons of the encyclical are independent of these disputes. It can hardly be doubted by a careful reader of the encyclical that one of its primary lessons is that a practical scheme of economics is inseparable from ethics, that economic legislation is a branch of practical ethics. The great fact which Leplay learnt from years of practical experiment and study is recognized by the Pope. But in place of stopping at the Decalogue and Sermon on the Mount as the instruments of ethical reform, Leo the Thirteenth takes the existing organization of the Church as the engine for enforcing on employers and employed alike the necessary virtues. And yet there is no pretense in the encyclical of *substituting* a sermon in place of practical action. It is rather a recognition that in the working of any economical machinery, the soundness of the ethical

wheels and chains is among the most important conditions of its running smoothly or continuing to run at all.

To profess to make the whole matter one for economics apart from ethics is to forget that all legislation for human beings presupposes as necessary links in the successful working of the system a number of ethical conditions. When an oath on the Gospels is regarded by law as ensuring veracious testimony, the legislation presupposes such a belief in the Bible as makes such an oath practically binding. A Mahometan would substitute the Koran. Should faith in a future life be weakened, the resulting weakness of the practical efficiency of the oath might have to be compensated by increasing the penalties for perjury. If the Austrian Catholic Socialists are right in supposing that the old feudal system in its palmy days secured protection for the vassal by his lord, it was largely in virtue of an ethical standard of *noblesse oblige*, which the aristocracy of the last century had lost. Remedial legislation is constantly based upon the existence of an impaired moral standard. We take precautions in a crowded town against dishonest practices which are unknown to the better country villages. Mill has well remarked that the best system of laws cannot be worked if judges and juries are open to corruption and witnesses perjure themselves. However indefinable and impalpable they may be in some cases, moral dispositions are among the most important factors in any system which regulates the conduct of human beings. No mere rules of school discipline could have effected the reform of Rugby which Dr. Arnold brought about by the moral elevation he imparted to the school by means chiefly of his personal influence on the monitors. Probably the system of M. Léon Harmel, on which economists dwell as a successful experiment in economics, owes just those characteristics which were decisive as to its success largely to conditions which are ethical rather than purely economical, to Harmel's own personal qualities, and to the religious loyal spirit which his own example has imparted.

The Pope throughout his encyclical recognizes the importance of the ethical factors, and it is in consequence of this recognition that he sees no royal road to a solution of the question by economics apart from religion, or by any cut and dried theory apart from the actual exercise of certain virtues on both sides.

Where the all-important ethical basis can be established Leo the Thirteenth is largely in sympathy with the actual programme of some of the Catholic democrats. This is beyond question, from the text of the encyclical and from his words, far exceeding a merely general and vague sympathy, to M. Harmel. In the encylclical he distinctly approves of workmen's associations, and of institutions which draw *patron* and artisan together, of benefit societies, and of

industrial organizations of employers and employed. Moreover, though discouraging as a rule the attempt to invoke the interference of the State, he does advocate it in pressing and extreme cases of injustice.[4] With regard to the organization at Val des Bois, it is on record that on occasion of an audience accorded to Harmel, in which Harmel fully opened his mind to the Holy Father, the Pope ended the interview with the emphatic words, "I approve of all you are the interview with the emphatic words, "I approve of all you have done in the past, of all you are doing to-day, and of all you are planning to do in the future."

The encyclical emphasizes the right of private property as a first principle. The Pope enumerates the moral forces which must determine the issues of economic measures, and their bearing on the solution of the problem. In the very front rank he places the danger of supposing that class is intended by nature to be hostile against class. Capital and labor have need of each other. Again, Utopian dreams of universal equality or unmitigated prosperity not only are misleading, but issue in bitterness and disappointment. "To suffer and endure is man's heritage." "All striving against nature is vain," he writes. And in several passages he warns the workman and his friends not to allow agitators to pervert a righteous movement into a means of fostering disaffection and disturbing order. The very absence of more decisive judgments on debated questions would seem significant of his view that the solution cannot be a matter of exact calculation, but must be determined by observation and experience. When it is debated whether some of Meyer's or De Mun's schemes would issue in a dangerous form of State Socialism, it is not enough to prove, in answer to such a fear, that they are theoretically reconcilable with the recognition of the rights of private property. The Pope himself supplies ampler criteria in the very passages which are complained of as vague. The question is, are you admitting a habit of State interference with individual liberty which atheistic Socialists may later on utilize for their own ends in tampering with rights which *you* yourself may hold to be fundamental to the existence of ordered society? Are you, again, introducing a scheme partitioned off from predatory Socialism by a partition which, however logically symmetrical, is not practically robust enough to stand against the popular tide? Is such an example as that of Abbé Daens in Belgium significant—in which democratic sympathies at one time carried a section of Catholics into open partisanship with the most extreme Socialists against a very moderately Conservative Government?

[4] M. Grégoire notes the important fact that the Pope treats the duty of employers to grant a living wage as one of *justice* and not as a counsel of charity.

The net result of the Pontiff's exhortation appears to be clearly in favor of such work as can be done so entirely under religious influences that the danger—of which he seems extremely apprehensive—of setting in motion revolutionary passion would be reduced to a minimum. The immense prominence of the forces on either side which are outside theoretical economics is perhaps the chief lesson the encyclical inculcates. The Socialist leaders on the continent are all (according to Professor Nitti) atheists, and the denial of private property and subversion of the family are their avowed aims. The Pope treats submission to God, preservation of the family, the right to private property, as the first principles of a wise popular movement. It is difficult to see how the general principles of the encyclical could be translated into the concrete more thoroughly than they have been in M. Harmel's organization. But we come again to the question—does this supply any hope for success on a wide scale in a civilization which does not, as a whole, recognize the Church, and in which consequently such organizations are possible only in very limited areas? It is doubtless the enforced consideration of a wider pudview which urged such men as Vogelsang or Decurtins to bolder action. All their efforts have received acknowledgments from the Pope. Nevertheless the obvious outcome of the encyclical is that there is no adequate remedy to be found as long as society is governed by irreligious aims, does not face those facts of life of which religion ever reminds us, and makes war on the Church, which is the natural guardian of religious principles. Dreams of equality, dreams of milleniary happiness, dreams that any happiness can be won by those who fail to cultivate the spirit of contentment and of endurance—such dreams are contradicted by the teaching both of experience and of the Gospel, and if they are persisted in the awakening must be bitter and disappointing. The Catholic bishops to whom the encyclical was addressed were exhorted on their side to do what they could to restore to men a belief in the ideals of the Gospel on these subjects. This encyclical on the great economic problem ends with words which will strike some readers as "vague sermonizing," and others as the very essence of any programme which is to succeed. One is the view of those who regard the crucial remedy of the evil as a matter for theoretical economic calculation; the other of those who look rather to the practical strengthening of that link in the chain of causes which consists of certain moral aims and a certain moral temper on the part of employers and employed alike, and the strenuous exclusion of their opposites.

"Every minister of holy religion [the Pope writes] must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance; with your authority, venerable brethren, and by your

example, they must never cease to urge all men of every class, on the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of the Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves and try to arouse in others Charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results for which we all long must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of charity, of that true Christian charity which consists in the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against unholy pride and an immoderate love of self, whose office is described, whose Godlike features are drawn, by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: 'Charity is patient, is kind . . . seeketh not her own . . . suffereth all things . . . endureth all things.'"

WILFRID WARD.

London.

THE HISTORICAL AND RELIGIOUS ORIGINS OF OUR RECENT IMMIGRANTS FROM EASTERN EUROPE.

AMONG the members of that very small minority of the inhabitants of the United States in whose veins a preponderancy of English blood is said—by themselves—to flow, there are some who still give credence to the historically inaccurate and ethnologically absurd assertion that the early glories and quickly-developed prosperity of the Republic are mainly due to "Anglo-Saxons." But even these innocents, many of whom are jejune of historical knowledge, and others of whom care not for an enlightenment which would dissipate their prejudices, cannot ignore the fact that during the last twenty or thirty years—to say nothing of the consequences of the Irish influx during many previous years—the presumed "Anglo-Saxons" have been relegated to an enforcedly modest position. In view of this eloquent truth, we may interest some of our readers if we devote a few pages to the origins of those peoples of eastern Europe who have recently contributed toward the formation of what will in the future become a practically homogeneous American Nation. As for the Irish, Germans, Italians, French, and Spaniards, whose blood has already transmogrified the "Anglo-Saxon" stock, their history speaks for itself.

Among all the eastern European peoples who have joined in the recent immigration, their numbers and importance demand that

first consideration be accorded to the Slavs, a Japhetic race who probably descend from Riphat, the third son of Gomer, and whose Asiatic origin is plainly evinced by their ancient language, and by their ancient religion and institutions. The ancient Slavs, known to the Greeks and Romans as Sarmatians, were repeatedly vanquished, but never permanently subjugated by the Quirites; and together with the Teutons, they were the means wherewith Divine Providence subverted the fourth of the empires seen in the vision of Daniel. The word "Slav" is encountered in no historical chronicle before the fourth century of the Christian era; the term is variously derived from *slava*, signifying "glory," and from *slovo*, which means a language; our own word "slave" reminds us of the miserably degraded condition into which the ancient Slavs had fallen. When the Slavs emigrated from Asia, they seized on the region extending from the Urals to the Vistula; and from the Black Sea, the Caucasus, and the Caspian, to the Baltic. One of their off-shoots, the Vends, finally extended their territories to the Illyrian and Carnic Alps; and a family of these Vends, termed Vindils, settled in the eastern portion of that region which is now known as Prussia—in fact, these Slavs were the progenitors of those Borussii or Prussians who were destined to be Germanized, some twelve centuries afterward, and at length to pose as leaders of the German peoples. Other tribes of Vends came to be known as Tchecks or Czecks, Slovacks, etc. From the first day of their meeting in Europe the Slavs and the Germanic tribes were in continual combat; and as fast as the Germans retired from the northern and eastern regions, the Slavs took their place. The ancient Slavs recognized a Supreme Being, but they also adored many inferior deities, both good and evil; and in time they adopted other divinities from the Greeks, Romans, and even from their hated foes, the Germans. In the olden days the Slavs were simple-minded; and Russian Slavophiles would have us believe that they were pastoral and gentle, and therefore fond of the arts of peace; but it is certain that they were malevolent and cruel until they were converted to Christianity. They invariably tortured their prisoners of war, and they respected their women so little that no man was ever punished for the murder of one; when a husband died, his wife was forced to kill herself, and this custom prevailed among the Poles until the tenth century, and very much longer among the Russians; it was an ordinary thing for mothers to slaughter their infants; human butchery alone could appease the *Tzerneboch* or Black God of the ancient Slavs. No Slavic people embraced Christianity before the seventh century. Then the Croats, newly arrived on the shores of the Adriatic, asked the Byzantine emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, for missionaries; and at the request of that prince, the Holy

See sent priests to them, and they were instructed and baptized, after they had sworn to abstain from every species of rapine. The conversion of the Russians did not even begin until the ninth century.

We know that the Slavs of our day consist of three branches: the Russians and Illyrians; the Poles, Bohemians, and Vends; and the Lithuanians. But we know nothing as to the identity of the first inhabitants of that land which became in time at least fundamentally Slavic, and which is now termed European Russia. The olden Roman writers gave the vague name of "Cymri" to those barbaric hordes who roamed in the regions immediately north of the Bosphorus; while they designated as "Scythians" and "Sarmatians" those barbarians who inhabited the more northern lands. These Scythians and Sarmatians were at one time termed "Rossolans," and some authors regard them as purely and simply Slavs; the founders of Novogorod were certainly Slavs, and such probably were the founders of Kiev, the second city of olden Russia. Nestor, the oldest of Russian chroniclers (d. 1116), contradicts the notion that the name "Russia" was derived from Ross, a son of Lech, the first prince of Poland; as also the theory in accordance with which the name came from the Rossolans or Roxans who once roamed along the banks of the Dnieper. The Russian monk holds that the designation was given by Scandinavian immigrants—a theory which favors the belief that Rurick the Norman applied the term in honor of his own native place, Rosland. We have already noted[1] that many Normans were found among the merchants from Novogorod who proceeded from Constantinople to the court of Louis le Débonnaire; and here we may add that the Lombard bishop and chronicler, Luitprand, in the report of the mission to Constantinople which he undertook for Otho of Germany in 968, speaks of "the Roussios, whom we also term Normans." If we may credit the assertions of Ibn-Foslan, whom the caliph of Bagdad sent as a missionary of Islam to those lands in the early part of the tenth century, the still Pagan Russian Slavs were then nearly as brutal as the Anglo-Saxons and the Huns had been before their conversion to the true faith; their physical and moral filth were phenomenal. Referring the reader to our account of the enterprise of Rurick the Norman, who was the prime founder of the Russian Empire,[2] we now note that after the death of Sviatoslav, son of Igor and Olga, in 973, his three sons, Oleg, Jaropok, and Vladimir, reigned simultaneously; the first over the Drevlians, the second at Kiev, and the third at Novogorod. War soon ensued between the brothers; and finally Vladimir, aided by an army of

[1] See our article on "The Commencements of the Normans" in the QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. XXVII.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

those Normans whom he and his fellows termed "Varangians," became sole monarch of the incipient Russian Empire. During his entire reign at Kiev (980-1014), Vladimir proved himself a valiant warrior; but until he became a Christian his morals, even according to the Pagan code, were abominable. In 988 he reduced the city of Kherson, then the capital of a sort of republic under the protection of the Lower Empire. It was from Kherson that Vladimir sent to Constantinople a request for the hand of the imperial princess, Anna; and according to Nestor, her arrival in Kherson was followed immediately by the baptism of Vladimir under the name of Vassili (Basil), and by the consequent cure of the prince from an almost entire blindness which a severe illness had brought upon him. This prodigy, together with the more than moral influence of Vladimir, induced his principal boyards and military officers to become Christians; and he evinced his gratitude to the Byzantine emperor by a renunciation of his right of conquest over Kherson, and by the loan of an army of Varangians, Franks, and Slavs, for the repression of the rebellion of Bardas Phocas. Having returned to Kiev, the grand-duke or grand-prince, as he was styled, effected the destruction of all the idols in his dominions; and to render the immolation more impressive, he ordered the statue of Perouna, a goddess whom he had specially venerated, to be beaten with rods, fastened to the tail of a horse, dragged to the Dnieper, and flung into the water. A church was erected on the spot where the statue of Perouna had stood, and another arose on the site of the martyrdom of Theodore, a Christian officer whom Vladimir had put to death because of his opposition to the sacrifice of his own son on the altar of the goddess. It is true that Vladimir, with the ill-balanced enthusiasm of a neophyte, undertook a forcible Christianization of his people; thus, on the morning after the disgrace of Perouna, he caused the baptism of all the inhabitants of Kiev. But he did not neglect the instruction of the "converts;" schools were established for their indoctrination into the Christian mysteries as illustrated by the Slavonic Liturgy which had been prepared by Sts. Cyril and Methodius—a Liturgy which was written, not in the continually changing vernacular of the Slavs, but in the language which is now termed the Old Slavonic, a mixture of the Thessalonic Greek with the Illyrian and Serb tongues. It was with great difficulty that Vladimir persuaded the Slavic parents, even those of elevated station, to send their children to these schools; these parents often wept as they consigned their little ones to institutions which were to initiate them, as was the popular belief, into an "art" which had been invented by sorcerers. By degrees, however, education followed in the wake of religion; and ere long the Slavic character exhibited a change like that which illustrated the

life of Vladimir—a change which afterward led the Russians to regard that monarch as not only "the Great," but also as "the Saint." He became the father of the poor; and his Christian gentleness, replacing his quondam Pagan ferocity, carried him to the extreme of punishing even murder with a simple fine, until the clergy showed him that an increase of crimes against the sanctity of human life demanded a restoration of capital punishment. Jeroslav, a son of Vladimir (1014-1054), was the first Russian sovereign to attempt a codification of the laws of his principality. Warned by the ambition of the patriarchs of Constantinople, no less than by the arrogance of the Byzantine emperors, he induced the Russian bishops, assembled at Kiev in 1051, to elect a metropolitan. The relations of Jaroslav with foreign nations were beneficial to his people. His sister, Mary, espoused Casimir, king of Poland; his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, was wedded to Harold, king of Norway; and his second daughter, Anna, married Henry I., king of France. Imitating Vladimir, who had instituted great schools in Kiev, he founded similar ones at Novogorod. He invited artists from Constantinople, and some of these minted the first Russian coins. Isiaslav, son of Jaroslav (1054-1078), was dethroned by his brother, Sviatoslav, in 1073. He appealed to Pope St. Gregory VII. for justice, although the Photian Schism, revived by the Constantinopolitan patriarch, Cerularius, was then trying to invade his dominions. He promised to recognize the Pontiff as his temporal lord, just as the Russian Church had hitherto recognized the Holy See as its spiritual head; and accordingly he besought the Pope to accept the suzerainty of the Russian monarchy. Probably this tender of vassallage had no practical sequel; although among the letters of Pope St. Gregory VII.[3] we find one addressed "To the King of the Russians," and couched in these significant terms: "Your son, having visited the Tomb of the Apostles, came to us, and earnestly besought us to grant him the grace of receiving your kingdom from our hands as a gift from St. Peter, after he would have promised to the said Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the obedience which is due to him. Your son also assured us that his request would be endorsed by you as soon as it would be heeded by our Apostolic authority. Therefore, since we regard his request as proper because of your consent, and because of the piety of the prince himself, we have finally granted it, entrusting him, in the name of St. Peter, with the government of your kingdom, and intending and hoping that St. Peter will intercede for you both at the Throne of God." Having now given an epitome of the origins of the Russian Slavs who have emigrated to these United States of North America, we indicate our already cited articles in

[3] Book II., Epistle 74.

this *Review* to the reader who is curious as to the origin of the Russian so-called "Orthodox" Church—an origin which is ascribed by English and German heterodox publicists to "the Greek Church," said appellation being of course understood as significant of an organization which is supposed to have been, at that time, hostile to the "pretensions" of the Roman See. In those articles we showed that the Russian Church is not Schismatic (or rather heretical) Greek in its origin; and that it is not Greek in its language, its polity, or its government. Very few members of the heretical "Orthodox" Church have taken residence in our republic; but their presence is indicated by the disturbances which frequently occur in congregations of the Greek Rite which are in full communion with the Roman Pontiff—disturbances which are generally incited by the emissaries of that Russian imperial-ecclesiastical coterie which is known as the "Holy Synod."[4]

Entering upon a brief sketch of the commencements of the Kingdom of Poland, we observe that the first indications of a Polish state are found in the eighth century; but long before that period, the regions known afterward as Courland, Greater and Lesser Poland, and Lithuania, had been inhabited by Slavic tribes who were termed Lettones or Lechs, and who, finally grouping themselves together, came to be designated as Polones or Slavs of the Plains—*polé*. Polish tradition narrates how Leszk or Lech, the first *voivod* or prince of the Poles, founded Gnesen and Posen; how the death of his successor entailed a division of the principality among the twelve minor *voivods*, the new states becoming so many palatinates; and how the tyranny of the petty princes induced the people to insist on a government by one monarch. This first sovereign was Craco, who assumed the title of *krol* about the year 600, founded the city of Cracow, and undertook a successful campaign against the Austrasian Franks. Craco was succeeded by his two sons, and then by his daughter, Vanda, the events of whose career, as they have been handed down to our time, seem to be legendary rather than

[4] The curious reader who wishes to investigate the early history of the Russians, whether in its civil or in its ecclesiastical phases, may consult: Cantù, "Storia Universale," Bk. x., Turin, 1862; Nestor, "Annals," Edition Schlozer, Gœttingen, 1802; Assemani, "Calendaria Ecclesiæ Universæ," Rome, 1755; Turgeniev, "Historica Russiæ Monumenta," St. Petersburg, 1841; Herbinius, "De Religiosis Kioviensibus Cryptis," cited by the Bollandists, "Acta Sanctorum," at Mch. 9; Beugnot, "Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident," Paris, 1855; Brotonne, "Histoire de la Filiation et des Migrations des Peuples," Paris, 1857; Brzowski, "Dissertatio de Origine Christianæ Religionis in Russia," Rome, 1822; Verdière, "Origines Catholiques de l'Eglise Russe jusq'au Douzième Siècle," Paris, 1857; Rambaud, "La Russie Epique," Paris, 1876; Duchesne, "Les Eglises Separées," Paris, 1897; Hergenrœtherb, "Monumenta Græca ad Photium, Ejusque Historiam Pertinentia," Ratisbon, 1869; Ralston, "Early Russian History," London, 1874; Anton, "Verusch uber die alten Slaven." Leipsic, 1785; Dobrowski, "Untersuchung woher die Slaven ihren Nahmen erhalten haben," Prague, 1784; Karamsine, "Geschichte von Russland," Riga, 1820; Kaisarov, "Slavinski Mithologia," Moscow, 1807; Shaffarik, "Slavianskia Drevnosti," Moscow, 1857.

historical. She is described as a haughty Amazon who defended herself and her kingdom against the Germanic tribes not only with her sword, but with the power of her beauty and eloquence. Proud of her virginity, Vanda spurned all offers of marriage; therefore her demise enabled the *voivods* to repartition the kingdom. Honwever, about the year 750, an obscure soldier, named Przemysl (Premislaus), united the nation under his strong rule; and it was not again divided until the perpetration of the monumental infamy of 1772. Few historians have cared to note that the Holy See, ever ready to perpetuate a nation's title to the gratitude of Christendom, conferred on the Polish kingdom, almost at its birth as a Christian state, the designation of "Most Orthodox," just as it had rewarded the zeal of the first French monarch with the style of "Most Christian." It was only during the reign of Boleslas the Great (992-1025) that complete success crowned the efforts for the Christianization of the Poles—a task which, together with the significance of the United Greek Rite among the Poles, we have already described in the previously cited articles. The reign of Boleslas the Great was devoted less to conquest, than to an amelioration of the condition of his people. He had found the Poles divided into several classes: the *servi* or slaves; the *liberati* or serfs; the *rustici* or agriculturists, who were really a kind of lesser nobles; and finally the veritable nobility. A wise demarcation of the rights of these classes was the chief object of the reign of Boleslas; an assimilation of them all into one mass of citizens of equal standing, and at one stroke of the pen, would have been impossible. He partitioned the kingdom into *civitates* or districts; he endeavored to draw the populations into the *burgi* or cities; and outside every city, he procured the construction of one or more castles, in which resided nobles who were entrusted with the maintenance of order, the administration of justice, the collection of taxes, and the control of military service. He visited personally every one of these castles at least onnce in three years, being always accompanied by his council of six ecclesiastical and six lay peers, who assisted him in the adjudication of cases of appeal from the decisions rendered by the authorities of the first instance.

Miecyslas II., son and successor of Boleslas the Great, was an illustration of the historical truth that a great ruler is seldom succeeded by another of similar calibre. Miecyslas was weak and indolent; and he allowed his wife, a German, not only to rule in his name, but even to attempt the Germanization of Poland. German invaders seized the western provinces while Miecyslas followed his policy of *laissez faire;* and then the castellans, true to the Polish proverb which says that a Pole will never be a brother to a German so long as the sun shines, threw off their allegiance, and declared their independ-

ence. On the death of Miecyslas, in 1034, his German widow, Rixa, was forced to flee with her son, Casimir, and Poland fell into anarchy. Fortunately for the country, Rixa had sent her boy, 18 years old at the time of the revolution, to France for his education; and for that purpose he had selected the celebrated Benedictine monastery of Cluny, joining the order, and receiving the diaconate in due time. In 1041 a deputation from Poland summoned him to the government of a people who were tired of dissension. Pope Benedict IX. released him from his monastic vows, and also from his clerical obligation of celibacy; he donned the Polish crown, and married Anna, sister of Vladimir, grand-duke of Russia. Casimir brought many of the monks of Cluny into Poland; and soon the land beheld the miracles of agriculture, bridge-building, etc., which had caused the sons of St. Benedict to be blessed throughout Western Europe as exponents of the Catholic spirit in its apposite task of civilizing barbarians. With the aid of his quondam companions of the cowl, Casimir banished the surviving remnants of Paganism from his kingdom. He reconquered all that his predecessor had lost to the Russians and Germans; and he compelled the Prussians, still a Slavic and a Pagan people, to swear vassallage to the Polish crown. When he died, in 1058, his people well said that Casimir had restored Poland. Boleslas II., called "the Rash" (1058-1081), was a brave prince, and generally a wise ruler; but he was a tyrant, and his morals were of the worst. The catastrophe of his life arrived when he murdered, with his own hand and at the altar of God, the holy Bishop of Cracow, Stanislaus, because the prelate had denounced the royal excesses. Excommunicated and therefore dethroned by Pope St. Gregory VII., and abandoned by all, he fled to a retired spot in Hungary, and in order to do penance for his sacrilegious crime, entered a monastery as a lay brother, keeping his identity a secret; he was put to work in the kitchen, and not until he was about to emit his last breath did the monks learn that their humble scullion had once sat on the throne of Poland. The royal murderer had certainly shown sorrow for his crime; but Pope St. Gregory VII. declared that the foul sacrilege could not be sufficiently punished on earth by the dethronement, or by any penance, of the guilty king. He deprived Poland of the dignity of a kingdom, and reduced it to the rank of a duchy. Two hundred and forty years passed ere a Polish duke, Ladislas Logotek, dared to ask the Holy See to lift the heavy censure; in 1319 this prince begged Pope John XXII. to allow him and his legitimate successors to be styled: "King of Poland by the grace of God, and by the favor of the Apostolic See," and the request was granted. Vladislas I. (1081-1102), brother of the wretched Boleslas II., saw the beginning of the Crusades, but he

took no part in the enterprise; he fought successfully against the Bohemians, and also against the still Pagan Prussians, those Slavs who bore with ill grace the yoke of vassalage which Casimir had imposed upon them. Such were the commencements of that noble Polish nation, of which so many thousand members have recently fled from Russian "Orthodox" and Prussian Protestant persecution in order to blend their glorious stock with those many others which are forming a people which promises to become, ere long, a Catholic nation. When that consummation shall have been reached, it will probably be seen that, after the Irish immigration, no other will have contributed to it so powerfully as the Polish—an immigration of Catholics whose religious glories are excelled only by those of whom we read in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*.[5]

Very few years have elapsed since the first Hunnish invasion of the great North American Republic. Like all the other immigrants to the Western World—Spaniards, Frenchmen, "Anglo-Saxons," Irishmen, Germans, Italians, and Asiatics of every description—who have made for themselves, during the last five centuries, new homes in the modern "Promised Land," these Hungarians came and will come in order to better their condition. Just as were nearly all the other immigrants who helped to relegate the real Americans of the north to another "Promised Land," the Hungarians now among us are endowed with little else than brawn and muscle, and a determination to prosper in the race of life. The ignorant, as well as the self-complacent who try to forget the struggles for existence which their almost immediate forbears endured, describe these later immigrants as "Hunks," in a spirit very like that which Latin Americans manifest when they designate as "Gringos" those Yankee prospectors and insolent tourists who seem to presage an undesirable evolution among them. But the history of Hungary shows that her sons possess qualities which will add to the strength of the coming American Nation. During the latter half of the eighth century, the Franks and the Bulgarians destroyed that empire of the Avari in Pannonia and Dacia which had succeeded to that of the Huns of Attila. About the year 884 there appeared in those regions a new conglomeration of hordes, concerning whose origin nothing in the way of certainty can be predicated, but who, according to the more probable opinion, had dwelt, before the fifth century, in the Himalayan regions

[5] For details of the commencements of Poland, consult: Cantù, *loc. cit;* Assemani, *loc. cit;* Lequien, "Oriens Christianus," Paris, 1713-34; Lescœur, "L'Eglise en Pologne," Paris, 1876; Koklius, "Introductio ad Historiam Slavorum," Altona, 1729; Salvandy, "Histoire de Pologne avant et sous Jean Sobiesky," Paris, 1827; Chwalkowski, "Jus Publicum Regni Poloniæ," Paris, 1705; Kulczynski, "Relationes Authenticæ de Statu Ruthenorum cum Sancta Romana Ecclesia Unitorum," Rome, 1727; Harasiewicz, "Annales Ecclesiæ Ruthenicæ Gratiam et Communionem cum Sancta Sede Romana Habentis, Ritumque Græco-Slavicum Observantis," Leopolis, 1862.

at the north of China. They styled themselves "Madyares," an appellation which the westerns soon turned into "Magyars," and which was probably derived from the name of one of their chiefs. There seems to be no reason for doubting the identity of this race with that of the olden Huns who were frequently termed "Oogours," "Hunigours," and "Hunigares." The word "Hungarian" is evidently derived from these appellations; and we know that the term "ogre," which entered into all European languages in the ninth and tenth centuries, as significant of a bloodthirsty monster, was meant to indicate the uncouthness and cruelty of the Hunnish barbarians who had not yet been brought by the Church to the civilization with which she had already endowed the other European barbarians—the Franks, the Anglo-Saxons, the Germans, most of the Scandinavians, and all of the Slavs except the Prussians whose conversion was not to occur before the thirteenth century. The religious tenets of these Hungarians would indicate that after their abandonment of the Himalayan regions, probably in the early years of the fourth century, they had roamed for many years in that part of Central Asia which borders on Persia; although it is true that some of them had settled at once in the land of the Bashkirs in Eastern Russia, where they were subjugated by the Turks in the sixth century. The greater part of the nation, however, halted in the regions situated between the Caspian and the Volga; and there, as the Byzantine historians tell us, they were found by the ambassadors whom Justin II. sent to the Turks in 569. During the two following centuries they moved gradually westward; and Nestor speaks of one of their hordes as passing near Kiev in 898, while it is certain that some of them had already penetrated into Moravia in answer to an invitation extended by the Slavs of that land who desired their aid against the Germans. Compelled by a Turkish advance to fall back on the Carpathians, the Hungarians were soon driven from their new territories by the Bulgarians; but in 884, their chief, Almus, replied to the invitation of the Byzantine emperor, Leo the Philosopher, by leading his followers through Pannonia until he reached the left bank of the Danube. In 892 Arpad fixed them so firmly in Pannonia that it became their future residence, or rather headquarters; for a century was to elapse ere the accession of St. Stephen would put an end to the devastations with which they filled Germany and France, and at times even Italy. In 900, while Arpad was consolidating his duchy of Hungary, several of his enterprising sub-chiefs ravaged Carinthia, and having crossed the Friulan Alps, devastated Lombardy as far as Pavia. Berengarius, who had triumphed over his adversaries, and was then undisputed king of Italy, advanced against the barbarians, defeated them, and pursued them as far as

the Brenta, where they offered to restore all their captives and plunder, if the Italian monarch would allow them to recross the Alps. The proposition was rejected by Berengarius, who had deemed the opportunity favorable for an extermination of such redoubtable enemies of Christendom; but desperation so animated the Hungarians that in the ensuing battle they were victorious, and they did not evacuate the peninsula until their booty had satisfied even their phenomenal greed. In 905 they made another raid, killed 20,000 of the warriors whom Berengarius opposed to them, and sacked Pavia and Brescia; in fact, they did not pause in their work of rapine until Berengarius paid them an immense sum of money, and furthermore promised to pay them well if they would help him to repel Rudolph of Trans-Juran Burgundy, who was then trying to deprive him of the crown of the Holy Roman Empire which he had received from Pope John X. in the year 915. The wicked compact having been made, the Magyars began their campaign by sacking Milan and Pavia; in the latter city they murdered its bishop and also the bishop of Vercelli, and they leveled forty-three churches to the ground. Having ravaged the north of Italy until they were defeated by the Venetians at Malamocco and Rialto, they turned their arms against the south. Capua, Salerno, Benevento, Nola, Montecassino, and Taranto were pillaged; and so terrible were the traces of their passage through the land, that the Italian chroniclers of the time inform us that the populations wondered whether or not their enemies were followers of Gog and Magog, the precursors of the Last Judgment. The flat and brutal countenances of the Hungarians must have been horrors indeed, since scars of battle were not the sole distinguishing mark of a male Hungarian of those days; every Hungarian mother was wont to bite the face of the male babe at her breast in order to accustom him to pain, and since these bites continued during his early boyhood, or until the production of the desired effect, the features of the grown man must have presented a hideously seamy appearance.

France also suffered from Hungarian irruptions. In 917, while Charles the Simple was engaged with his domestic enemies, Lorraine was ravaged; another invasion, which extended to the Aisne and to the Atlantic, occurred in 926; and as late as 933 a third though minor raid was effected. An attempt of the Magyars to pass into Spain, in order to possess themselves of the treasures amassed by the caliphs of Cordova, was successfully resisted by Raymond Pons, Count of Toulouse, whose Christian animosity to the Saracens did not blind him to the danger of increasing the arrogance of the Pagans; and after their defeat by this French knight, a plague so weakened the surviving Magyars in France, that the Land of the Lilies was soon freed from their presence.

It was Germany, however, that suffered most from the race of Attila; although far less rich a land than either Italy or France, and therefore less attractive to the freebooter, Germany was especially hated by the Magyars as being the nearest Christian neighbor to the region which they had marked for their own. Zoltan, son of Arpad, forced Conrad of Franconia to pay him tribute, after he had defeated and killed Leopold of Bavaria, the commander of the army of the last Carolingian king of the Germans (907). In 919 Zoltan defeated and killed Conrad; and then the Magyars had full play in Franconia, Bavaria, and Saxony. Henry the Fowler also became tributary to Zoltan in 924; but in 933 Henry engaged the Hungarians in the battle of Merseburg, in which 40,000 of them are said to have fallen, and thus he taught Zoltan to be more wary. In 955 Zoltan again invaded Germany while Italian matters were occupying the attention of Otho I., the first Holy Roman Emperor of the German line. Augsburg was besieged; but its bishop, Ulderic, with his priestly stole crossed on his breast, headed the citizens in a brave defense until the arrival of the emperor with a powerful army. We note that Otho wielded the sword of Charlemagne, and a lance pointed with one of the nails used at the crucifixion of Our Lord, in the furious battle which ensued; but we also read that he put all his prisoners to death, hanging three of the principal Hungarian chiefs on the walls of Ratisbon. This defeat prevented the Hungarians from troubling Western Europe during the next thirty years; they turned their attention to the Lower Empire, ravaging Thrace and Macedonia, and pushing their way even to the walls of Constantinople, where their army was almost annihilated. In vain they now entered into alliance with the Russians; a crushing defeat at Adrianople forced the survivors to return to Pannonia. The time was now approaching, however, when the Church was to style Hungary "the Kingdom of Mary." About the year 970, St. Wolfgang, a Benedictine monk who afterward became bishop of Ratisbon, led several of his monastic companions to a projected conquest of Hungary for the Church of Christ; and when failure had ensued, the Apostolic work was resumed in 973 by Bruno, bishop of Werden, and by Piligrin, bishop of Passau. Five hundred converts had been made, when war again ensued between the Hungarians and the Germans. Most of the neophytes returned to Paganism; but with the advent of peace in 985, St. Adalbert, who was destined to be martyred by the Prussians, induced Geyza, the Hungarian chief or duke, to receive Baptism. However, this princely conversion was, at least for a time, of problematical sincerity; for some years Geyza practiced simultaneously both Christianity and Paganism, replying to an episcopal rebuke that he was "sufficiently rich to worship all the gods that existed." Waic,

a son of Geyza, who received the name of Stephen at the baptismal font, evinced his sincerity as a Christian in every act of his career; and he became the veritable apostle of Christianity among his people. When his zeal, especially in the matter of an emancipation of all the slaves in Hungary, caused a revolt of his subaltern chieftains, he proclaimed a war against the recalcitrants in the name of Christ. Having vanquished his domestic foes, and having arranged a solid peace with all his neighbors, he devoted the remainder of his reign to the extirpation of idolatry; and in this work he was aided not only by the monks of St. Benedict, but by the fact of his marriage with Gisela, a sister of St. Henry II., one of the few Holy Roman Emperors of the German line who filled properly their position in the Christian body-corporate. The zeal of Stephen extended beyond his own dominions. In Jerusalem he founded and endowed a monastery; in Constantinople he erected a magnificent church; and in the Eternal City he established a college for the Hungarians, that is, an institution where worthy ecclesiastics of his nation might imbibe the true spirit of Papal Rome, and where Hungarian pilgrims might be entertained gratuitously. Long before the death of Stephen, ten bishoprics, under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Gran, were instituted and munificently endowed; and there was at least one church for every ten villages. When the work of Christianization had been fairly consolidated, Stephen sent to Rome, in the year 1000, precisely at the time when the Christian world is said by historians of the Gibbonian stamp to have been prostrated in panic because of a fear of the imminent end of all mundane things, a Hungarian bishop who was to present the following requests to the Pontiff. His Holiness was asked to consider the religious and political conditions of the nation which had recently been added to his fold; he was entreated to confirm the institutions established by Stephen; and as Vicar of Christ, the head of the *Populus Christianus*, he was urged to raise the duchy of Hungary, now dedicated in a special manner to the honor and service of the Mother of God, to the rank of a kingdom. Pope Sylvester II. accorded these requests, not only elevating Hungary to the rank of a kingdom, but conferring on Stephen and his legitimate successors the title of "Apostolic King," together with the absolutely unique privilege of having the Cross carried before them on all solemn occasions—prerogatives which have ever been jealously guarded by all Hungarian kings, even by such of the Hapsburg wearers of the crown of St. Stephen as showed themselves utterly unworthy of the succession. The chief conquest of Stephen was the region which we know as Transylvania, so termed because the Hungarians styled it *Erdely-Orszag* or *Trans Sylvas*, its situation being beyond the vast forests

of the Carpathians. When death came to Stephen in 1038, the evidences of his heroic sanctity induced Pope Benedict IX. to enroll him among the canonized saints. Emeric, son and heir of this holy monarch, and like him a saint, had died before his father's demise; and consequently Hungary suffered from anarchy until the accession of Geyza (1074-1077). The rulers who held successively a precarious grasp of the sceptre until the advent of Geyza, namely, Samuel, Andrew, Bela I., and Salomon, were unable to prevent the dismemberment of their kingdom by the kings of the Germans; a portion of Pannonia went to swell the then growing importance of the margraves of Austria. Geyza restored some amount of order in his dominions; and his brother, St. Vladislas (1077-1095), resumed the work of St. Stephen by the promulgation of many wise laws which he knew how to enforce. In 1089 he joined Croatia to Hungary, and soon afterward he rendered Bulgaria and Servia tributaries of his crown. He was preparing to join the French in the First Crusade, when death compelled him to leave a reconsolidated kingdom to his son, Coloman. Vladislas was canonized by Pope Celestine III.[6]

The Bohemians are by no means an unimportant element among those eastern Europeans who have contributed their quota to the formation of the now developing new American stock, and their share in the progress of Catholicism in our country has been greater than their numbers would indicate. But their historical and religious origin is generally so well known that merely a few words concerning it are here demanded.

The name of Bohemia is derived from that of the Boii, a tribe of Celts who settled in that region about 580 B. C. During the reign of Augustus these Boii were supplanted by the Marcomanni, who continued in possession of the country until the beginning of the seventh century of our era, when they were subjugated by the Czechs, a Slavic people who had chosen for their king a Frankish merchant named Samon, who had led them to victory against the Avari. Under this Frankish king (610-658), the Bohemian nation was consolidated; but after his demise, the monarchy gave place to several Czech republics, the principal one of which was that of Prague. In a few years, however, the monarchy was restored by Croc, probably one of the thirty-seven heirs whom the twelve Czech wives of Samon had given to that sovereign. A daughter of Croc, Libussa, suc-

[6] Consult: Cantù, *ubi supra*, Book X.; Chantrel, "Cours d'Histoire Universelle," Period II., Paris, 1885; Dussieux, "Essai Historique sur les Invasions des Hongrois," Paris, 1859; Bartholomæus, "Memorabilia Provinciæ," Czetnick, 1799; Pray, "Annales Hungarorum," Pesth, 1800; Patterson, "The Magyars, Their Country and Institutions," London, 1869.

ceeded to the throne in 720; and by her marriage with a peasant named Przemysl (Premislas) there was originated a dynasty which continued in power until its extinction in the fourteenth century.

Little is known concerning the successors of Przemysl until the accession of Borziwog (876-897), who was converted to Christianity by St. Methodius, but most of whose subjects refused to abandon Paganism. About the year 920, the few Christians in Bohemia were persecuted bitterly by Drahomira, the widow of Duke Vratislas; but when this princess warred on Henry the Fowler, she lost her throne, that German monarch putting her son, Wencislaus, in her place in 927, on condition that Bohemia should pay an annual tribute to the king of the Germans. Wenceslaus favored the propagation of Christianity among his people; and therefore his Pagan mother induced her second son, Boleslas, to murder him in 938. The first years of the fratricide's reign were signalized by virulent persecutions of the Christians; but when Emperor Otho I. appeared before Prague at the head of an army in order to enforce the payment of the tribute which Boleslas had refused, the Bohemian promised not only to fulfill his obligation, but also to tolerate missionary efforts among his subjects. Boleslas seems to have performed condign penance for his crime; at any rate, his latter years were those of a Christian. However, the conversion of Bohemia progressed but little until the reign of his son, Boleslas II., called the "Pious" (967-999). Bohemia was raised to the rank of a kingdom by Emperor Henry IV. in 1092 in favor of Duke Wratislas II.; but until 1230, when Wenceslaus III. mounted the throne, the royalty was elective.[7]

As yet comparatively few Moravians, Bulgarians, Moldavians, and Wallachians, have mingled their blood with that of the Anglo-Hibernico-Latino-Teutonic stock which started our Republic upon its career. But so many Moravians have already settled among us, and so strong are the indications that numbers of the other just mentioned peoples will soon do likewise, that the reader may not be displeased if we devote some space to their origin. Beginning with the Moravians and the Bulgarians, we note that in the fifth century of our era, the Vends, then one of the principal branches of the Slavic family, occupied the regions which had been abandoned by the Marcomani, Boii, Lombards, Vandals, Angles, and Saxons. Therefore the chief Vendic tribes, namely, the Moravians, Bohemians, and Obotriti, were neighbors of the Bavarians, Thuringians, etc.; and the conquest of these latter barbarians by the Franks brought the former into relationship with the Clodovingians. The

[7] Consult: Cantù, *ubi supra;* Freher, "Scriptores Rerum Bohemicarum," Heidelberg, 1599.

Obotriti of Dacia swore fealty to the Franks, and obtained lands in Pannonia; those of Nordalbingia (the region north of the Elbe) gradually appropriated the olden territories of the Saxons and Danes as these peoples moved to the conquest of Britain, and Mecklenburg ("the great city") became the residence of their prince or duke. The empire of the Moravians, so-called because they inhabited the lands in the neighborhood of the Morave, was soon overthrown by the Avari; afterward they became subject to the Bohemians; but about the year 805 they recovered their autonomy under the leadership of their "ban," Tudan, who paid homage to Charlemagne.

In 846, Ratislas, whom Louis "the Germanic" had placed on the Moravian throne, discontinued the tribute which was incumbent upon his vassalage; and since the refusal was equivalent to a declaration of war, Louis marched against him. Defeated, the emperor was barely able to evacuate Moravia; then Ratislas crossed the Danube and devastated Pannonia, easily defeating or outwitting the imperial generals. In 864 Louis returned with an immensely superior force, and compelled Ratislas to renew his engagement of fidelity; but in 872, when all the Slavs along the imperial frontiers arose in arms, the Moravians waged the most bitter war.

In 884 Charles the Fat congratulated himself on having obtained from Svientopolk a promise that the Holy Roman Empire would be spared during his lifetime; and when Emperor Arnoul found his states menaced by the Hungarians, he purchased a continuance of the Moravian toleration by a recognition of Svientopolk's annexation of Bohemia. This latter imperial concept was punished by the Bohemians; they renounced all obligations to an emperor who had betrayed them, and in 894 they turned the tables on Moravia by an annexation of it to their own domination. In an endeavor to vindicate his imperial claims, Arnoul ravaged Moravia; and the war continued until the guardians of Louis the Younger recognized the independence of Moravia, on the sole condition that it would pay tribute to the Holy Roman Emperor.

In 908 the Hungarians and the Bohemians partitioned the sorely-tried Moravian kingdom, leaving to its sovereign merely a small portion of its ancient territory which was thereafter known as the Margravate of Moravia, and was merely a dependency of Bohemia.

Before we speak of the conversion of the Moravians to Christianity, a few words must be devoted to the commencements of the Bulgarians, originally an Asiatic people whose early European history is deeply involved in that of the Lower Empire. Misled by the many Slavic words which crept into the language of the Kutri-guri during their long sojourn in the regions of the Volga (whence their later appellation as "Vulgari" or "Bulgari"), many historians have re-

garded them as Slavs—a blunder which is naturally pleasing to the Russian Colossus. But it is very probable that the Bulgari were of the same Mongolian stock as the Huns, Finns, and Lapps.

After the fall of Attila the Bulgarians endeavored to restore the Hunnish empire, and they were repelled by Theodoric the Ostrogoth; but when that monarch undertook his Italian expedition, leaving his home territories unprotected, the Bulgarians occupied the more desirable regions. Thrace soon became their prey; and from that time until the fall of the Lower Empire, they were, according to their necessities or their whims, either defenders of that power, or a thorn in its side. In 968, Svietoslav, grand-prince or grand-duke of Russia, complying with the request of the Byzantine emperor, Nicephorus Phocas, took possession of Bulgaria; but four years afterward, John Zimesces, successor of Nicephorus, expelled the Russians, and in 1018 Basil II. effected, as he thought, a definitive annexation of the principality to the Lower Empire.

In 1185 Emperor Isaac Angelus endeavored to deprive the Bulgarians of their flocks, whereupon a terrible war ensued, the insurgents being led by two brothers, Peter and Asan, and after their death on the field, by another brother named John. It was to this John that Pope Innocent III. accorded the title of King of Bulgaria.

The conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity was begun and almost completed in the year 865 by two Thessalonican Greeks, Sts. Cyril and Methodius. St. Cyril appears in history for the first time in 847, when, according to Anastasius the Librarian, he reproved Photius, afterward the prime author of the separation of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate from the unity of the Catholic Church, for teaching that there are two souls in man. Cyril insisted, says Anastasius, that it was the animosity of the future heretic against the legitimate patriarch, Ignatius, that was to drag the wretched man into apostasy. Shortly after this episode in the life of St. Cyril, and several years before Photius supplanted Ignatius and actuated his fell design, the Khazar Turks, then dwelling in the region between Bulgaria and Moravia, requested the empress-regent, Theodora, to send some missionaries to them. After consultation with Ignatius, the empress instrusted the task of converting the Khazars to St. Cyril. In a short time the *chagan* or khan and his principal officers were baptized, and ere long the entire nation followed their example. While St. Cyril was evangelizing the Khazars, a sister of Bogoris, prince of the Bulgarians, became a Christian in Constantinople, where she had been a prisoner of war for some years. Returning to her people, she tried to propagate the faith among them, beginning with her brother. Bogoris resisted her endeavors; but he expressed a desire that a Greek painter would come to him for the purpose of

decorating one of his residences. Theodora sent St. Methodius, a brother of St. Cyril, who, like many other monks of that day, was an excellent artist; and when Bogoris commissioned him to depict some event which would terrify the beholders, the holy man executed a tableau of the Last Judgment. The representation so impressed the prince, that he began to study the mysteries of the Christian religion; his baptism followed, probably in 865. One of the first steps of Prince Michael, as he was thenceforth styled, was to send an embassy to Pope Nicholas I., asking for more missionaries, and for some bishops for his people; he also asked the Pontiff for guidance in the matter of certain religious doubts which were agitating his Christian subjects. In reply, His Holiness urged the prince to use no violence toward such of the Bulgarians as persisted in idolatry. "Be content with exhortations," said the Pope; "try to convince the idolaters that their practices are futile; have no other relations with them, and thus you may fill them with a salutary confusion." The Pontiff blamed Bogoris for having amputated the nose and ears of a Greek layman who had represented himself as a priest, and had baptized many of the Pagans: "The man was indeed wicked when he posed as a priest, but you should have been content with his expulsion from your dominions; as for the baptisms which he administered, know that those baptisms are valid, if he conferred them in the name of the Holy Trinity, since the validity of a Sacrament does not depend on the virtue of its minister." Then after some instruction as to the observance of the Lord's Day and the Feasts of the Church, the Pope continues: "You ask me whether a patriarch for your people can be appointed. Know that the veritably patriarchal churches are those which received that preëminence from the Apostles; namely, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. It is true that the churches of Jerusalem and Constantinople now bear this title; but they do not possess any patriarchal authority. Certainly the church of Constantinople was not founded by any one of the Apostles; but since that capital was once styled 'the New Rome,' its bishop came to be termed a patriarch, but only by imperial favor, not in accordance with ecclesiastical law. We intend to appoint a bishop for your people; and when the number of Christians in Bulgaria warrants his promotion, we shall confer the dignity of an archbishop on that prelate." Immediately after the inditing of this letter, Pope Nicholas commissioned the bishops of Porto and Piombino for the completion of the work of St. Methodius; and in a few years Paganism was merely a memory among the Bulgarians.

In 867 Sts. Cyril and Methodius united in the task of converting the Moravians, having been invited by King Ratislas. It was for the better prosecution of this mission that St. Cyril invented that

Slavonic alphabet which is still used in Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, Moldavia, and Wallachia; and for the same purpose he translated the Scriptures and many works of the Fathers into Slavonic. It must not be forgotten, however, that four centuries previously St. Jerome had invented, or at least adapted, a "glagolitic" alphabet for the Moravians; and that the invention by St. Cyril was merely an improvement on the Hieronymite enterprise, being the Greek alphabet with an addition of ten characters indicative of sounds peculiar to the Slavic idiom. During the first days of the Pontificate of Adrian II., Sts. Cyril and Methodius proceeded to Rome in order to render an account of their mission. St. Cyril died soon afterward; and the Pontiff appointed St. Methodius as bishop of Moravia and of Pannonia. Some of the German bishops bore with bad grace this curtailment of their presumed jurisdiction; and in their name the bishop of Passau forwarded to the Holy See a complaint to the effect that St. Methodius had erred in matters of faith, and that he had violated ecclesiastical discipline by the use of Slavonic instead of Latin in the liturgy. Pope John VIII. ordered the saint to justify himself in Rome; in the meantime he was to use either Latin or Greek in the liturgy, although, of course, he and his priests should continue to preach in the Slavonic language. St. Methodius understood the virtue of obedience to legitimate authority; he proceeded to the Eternal City, and the result of his submission is given in the letter which the Pontiff sent to Sviatopolk, the successor of Ratislas: "We have questioned our venerable brother, Archbishop Methodius, as to whether he has held and chanted the Creed as it is presented by the Holy Roman Church, and he has proved that he does so in accordance with the traditions of this Holy See. We approve the Slavonic alphabet which was invented by the philosopher, Constantine (so St. Cyril had been termed before he became a priest), and we command that the actions and praises of Jesus Christ be proclaimed in the Slavonic language. But in order to manifest a special respect to the Gospel, we decree that in the celebration of the Holy Mass it be read first in Latin, and then immediately in Slavonic for the benefit of those who do not understand the Latin language." Shortly after St. Methodius returned to Moravia, he took the first step toward the conversion of the Bohemians, who were then vassals of the Moravian monarch. Borzivog, their prince, paid a visit to Sviatopolk, and was received with due honor; but when the royal party took their seats for dinner, the Bohemian, being a Pagan, was told to sit on the ground. The Christian prelate endeavored by extraordinary politeness to render the position of Borzivog less humiliating, and consequently their conversation became confidential. Little by little the truths of Christianity were explained to the

prince, and after the meal he asked for Baptism. Thirty of the Bohemian counts joined in the request of their lord, and after due instruction, the entire party became Christians. Priests went with them when they returned to their people, and the conversion of the nation was soon under way. Ludmilla, the wife of Borzivog, who had been a zealous idolatress, became a saint and a martyr, and she was the grandmother of St. Wenceslaus.[8]

To the average student in this country, the name of Roumania may possibly be known as that of an independent principality dating from the year 1859; but he scarcely knows the names of those ancient nationalities—Moldavia and Wallachia (Zara Romanesca)—which have formed the modern kingdom. Moldavia and Wallachia were the path by which, during many centnuries, Europe was entered by the barbarians from the regions of the Caucasus and the Caspian. The first inhabitants of these regions, at least the first mentioned in history, were the Agatirsi, whom Herodotus describes as having, in his day, become an effeminate race, and who afterward became the prey of the Scythians of the Euxine territories, and of the Geti—the latter originally a Thracian stock which had settled in the region bounded by the Danube, the Ems, and the Euxine. Amid the discordant opinions of the investigators into the limits and vicissitudes of the barbaric tribes who pounced upon Europe during the early centuries of our era, if we take as our guide Carlo Troya, an Italian historian who is the most profound of all these indagators, the Geti were the ancestors of those Goths whose name was so terrible in the Italy, southern France, and Spain of the fifth century. One of the most famous offshoots of the Getic stock was formed by the Dacians, who were also styled Davi or Dai, as we learn from the ancient Greek and Roman playwrights who were wont to describe promiscuously the clownish and rascally servants of their comedies as Geti, Dacians, Davi and Dai. We learn from Strabo that long after the Dacians had established themselves between the Danube and the Pruth, they continued to speak the language of the other Geti, namely, the Thracian; they preserved the Getic customs and also the Getic religion—that is, the cult of Zamolxes, having for their chief dogma the immortality of the soul which was destined to perpetual joy in company with Zamolxes if its possessor proved himself valorous in this life. According to Dion Chrysostom, a contemporary of Trajan, the Dacians were the most cultured of the barbarians of his day, and we may credit the assertion, since in the time of Julius Cæsar they had a code of laws which had been prepared by Deceneus, a Dacian who had studied in Egypt. This code was destined to be the basis for the laws of the Visigoths of Spain, and

[8] Consult: Cantù and Chantrel, *ubi supra;* the Bollandists, "Acta Sanctorum," at Mch. 9.

for the laws of the Ostrogoths of Italy. When Scribonius Curio, proconsul of Macedonia, carried the Roman eagles for the first time to the Thracian banks of the Danube in 73 B. C., the dominions of the Dacian king, Berebistus, reached from Bessarabia (the "Desert of the Geti") to the lands of the Boii in Hungary, and to the eastern limits of Bohemia. Scribonius dared not to penetrate the dense forests of Dacia; but his successor, Marcus Lucullus, not only repelled the Dacians from the frontier of Macedonia, but destroyed their city of Appolonia at the mouths of the Danube. After the death of Berebistus, the Dacian kingdom was partitioned among many petty sovereigns, and the Romans found it an easy task to repel their incursions, as well as those of their allies, the Sarmatians. But during the reign of Domitian, Decebalus reunited the Dacian sovereignties, established his capital in the natural fortress of Sarmisagetusa in the Southern Carpathians, and so far restored the glories of Berebistus as to extend his dominion throughout the Carpathian and Danubian regions, from the Theiss to the Dniester. To make matters worse for the Romans, Decebalus had studied their military art, and he became a master in strategy, fortification, entrenchment, etc. Oppius Sabinus and Cornelius Foscus were defeated successively, and the exultant Dacians hailed their king and his soldiers as *Ansi* or demi-gods, a title which was in time given by the Scandinavians to the legendary companions of Odin. The Roman general, Julianus, indeed almost destroyed the power of Decebalus, when he nearly annihilated the flower of the Dacian army in its own mountain fastnesses; but the ignoble Domitian hastened to regard the victory as an occasion for peace, decorating the Dacian prince with the royal insignia, sending to him many Roman engineers and artisans for the instruction of his warriors, and engaging to pay to him an annual tribute in the guise of a "donative." But when Trajan mounted the throne, this disgrace was amply revenged.

The commentaries on the two campaigns of Trajan against the Dacians, a work written by the emperor in imitation of the splendid "Commentaries" of Cæsar, have unfortunately perished; but the Column of Trajan in the Roman Forum remains to remind us of his glory and of the Dacian misfortune. Having constructed his magnificent bridge across the Danube which was to be of future strategetic advantage to the Romans, having declared Dacia a Roman province, and having founded the city of Nicopolis as a memorial of his victories, Trajan resolved on a consolidation of the Roman power in Dacia by means of Roman colonization. The colonists, as we learn from Eutropius, were not taken from Italy alone; every part of the empire furnished its quota, and Ptolemy says that there were even fifteen tribes of western barbarians among them; but fortunately the

Latin blood, language, and customs predominated. Near the ruins of Sarmisagetusa, which are still seen near Varbel in modern Transylvania, the Roman city of Ulpia Trajana (to-day Varhely or Gradiska) soon arose; and Ptolemy speaks of such other Roman cities as Zerna, Napuca, Apulo, Pretoria Augusta, Augustia, Marcodava, and Jassy. These cities were all connected by excellent Roman roads; and they were all so many centres of Latin civilization, while they formed a barrier against the new barbarians who then menaced the eastern frontiers of the empire. Meanwhile a nation of so-called "Free Dacians" was being formed in the neighborhood of Roman Dacia by those Daco-Geti who had fled from the yoke of Rome to the territories beyond the Pruth, and had intermarried with the olden peoples of those regions, thus producing the stock which came to be known as "Gothic." During two centuries these Free Dacians or Goths combatted the Roman Dacians with varying results. Adrian formed the design of abandoning the province which had been conquered and created anew by that Trajan whose glory he envied; and in the year 118 he partly demolished the great emperor's bridge. However, the abandonment was not effected until 275, when Aurelian ordered the Latin and other Roman colonists to evacuate the region, and to settle in a new Dacia which he named after himself, and which was soon divided to two Dacias—the *Ripensis* along the Danube, and the *Mediterranea*. The Roman occupation of Dacia had lasted for 168 years, and that fact alone would account for its traces which are still visible in the land which is now and quite properly termed Roumania. But it must be remembered that very many of the Roman Dacians refused to obey the summons of Aurelian; they chose to remain in the land which they loved as their own, and by intermarriage with the barbarians they perpetuated a naturally modified Latin idiom, with its attendant Latin customs and habits of thought, among the future Moldavians and Wallachians. From the fourth century until the fourteenth, these people of the Danubian Principalities suffered from more or less lasting occupations of their country by Goths, Tervingians, Vandals, Huns, Alani, Avari, Gepidi, Lombards, Bulgarians, Cumani, Magyars, Slavs, Mongols, and Tartars. And nevertheless, he who speaks Italian is at home in Roumania. Every Roumanian regards the memory of Trajan with something like veneration; he terms the great Roman emperor his father, and he speaks of the Milky Way as "the path of Trajan." Ask a Roumanian peasant as to his nationality, and you will hear: "*Eo sum Rumen*"—a fairly good paraphrase of "*Civis Romanus sum.*" And lest his children may forget their grand origin, surrounded as they are by Slavs and Germans, the Roumanian father teaches them that "*La un Rumen dece Sassi*—One

Roumanian is worth ten Saxons." At the end of a Psalter which was published by the metropolitan, Doristheus, during the reign of the "hospodar," Gregory Ghika II. (1726-1752), and intended for the instruction of the people of the Principalities, we read a kind of political Catechism in verse which begins with the question: *"Nemul t'eri Moldavi de unde derad'a?*—Whence came the inhabitants of this Moldavian land?" And the answer is: *"D'in t'era Italii, tot omul se cred'a*—From the land of Italy, as everyone knows." Then the instruction proceeds: "At first Flaccus, and then Trajan, led hither the ancestors of the present happy inhabitants of this country. They determined its frontiers, and the traces of their reign are still seen. The monuments left by Trajan still survive; *Turul Severinului* (the Tower of Severinus) is still unshakable." Following the investigations of D'Anville, the most accurate geographer of the eighteenth century, the best modern philologists admit that the *limba rumenesca*, in spite of its corruption from Slavic, Magyar, and Turkish sources, is Latin in its roots and inflexions—in fine, that it is substantially the archaic Latin, the *lingua rustica* which was spoken by the uneducated Romans in the days of Trajan. Even the name, Wallachia, indicates a land inhabited by people of Italian origin; for the Slavs have always applied the terms *Voloch*, *Vloch*, *Olach*, and *Wlassi* to the Italians. Just as in their language, so in their customs the Roumanians evince their Italian origin; their funerals, dances, marriage ceremonies, all exhibit features which were common among the Romans of the Empire, but which have been known, even in Italy during the last few centuries, only by students of the recondite. Even the superstitions of the Roumanians indicate a Roman mythological, as well as a barbaric origin; and not only in Moldo-Wallachia, but wherever any considerable number of Roumanians are settled, as in the east of Hungary, in Transylvania, and in Bessarabia. As for the history of the Roumanians during the Middle Age, its obscurity was not dissipated even by the indefatigable labors of Sinclai (d. 1820), a Transylvanian Roumanian whose *Chronica Romanilor* or "Chronicle of the Roumanians," beginning with the days of Decebalus, and ending at 1739 (Jassy, 1808-1853), has not yet been supplanted as a source of information in the premises.[9]

Reuben Parsons.

Yonkers, N. Y.

[9] Consult: Cantù and Chantrel, *ubi supra;* Muratori, "Novus Thesaurus Veterum Inscriptionum," p. 1001, Milan, 1739; Fabretti, "La Colonna Trajana," Rome, 1690; Ciacconio, "Historia Utriusque Belli Dacici, ex Columna Trajani," Rome, 1576; Piranesi, "La Colonna Trajana," Rome, 1770; Innocent III., "Regasta," VII., Epist. 8 ad Joannicium; La Civiltà Cattolica, "I. Principati Danubiani," Rome, 1859; "Lexicon Rumanescu-Latinescu-Ungarescu-Nemtescu," Buda, 1825; Dickinson, "Account of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia," London, 1820; Noyes, "Roumania, the Border Land of the Christian and the Turk," New York, 1857; Roeler, "Dacier und Romanen," Vienna, 1866; Engel, "Geschichte der Moldau und Walachei," Halle, 1804.

CARMELOGIA.

BY Contemplation man is united to God, so as to participate in the highest degree in the Divine Attributes and perfections, according to the words of St. Paul: "We all beholding the glory of the Lord with open face are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." It is the beholding which produces the transformation, for this gaze of the soul differs from the look of the bodily eyes inasmuch as it has an absorbing or assimilating power, so that it may be said to feed upon the object regarded. Cicero called contemplation the natural food of souls, and when used in this sense, tasting and seeing are synonymous. We may say equally "taste and see that the Lord is sweet" or see and taste the sweetness of the Lord. St. John says: "We shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is." We are transformed by beholding. Blosius does not hesitate to call this mystical union of Contemplation the deification of the soul. Face to face in the absorbing gaze of love, the soul sees itself in God and God beholds Himself in the soul (sui in Deo, Dei in se) and the Divine rays form a bond of union, so that they are no longer two, but one, in attributes and perfections, [Plane tota Dei color est quia essentia ejus essentia Dei perfusa est], and thus is fulfilled the mandate of Heaven, "be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." The perfection of God is in seeing and loving Himself, the perfection of the soul is in seeing and loving God and himself in God. Christ has said: "He that loveth his life shall lose it," and the soul that loves itself as God loves it, will be lost to earth only to find itself by contemplation as conceived from all eternity in the operations of the Divine mind. One with God, lifted above space and time it will live in the eternal present of Him who is, seeing all things as He sees them, willing as He wills and thus truly and indeed "partaking of the Divine nature." Here is the accomplishment of the prayer of the Church uttered each day in the Sacrifice of the Mass at the mingling of the wine and water, the most perfect type of this mystical union which it foreshows. Therefore it is clear that Divine Contemplation is the highest act of man, for what act can be higher than the one which brings about the union of the Creator and creature and fulfils the end for which man was created—the contemplation of heavenly things.

And here let us make four considerations. Contemplation is an act—it is the highest act of man—it is useful, and it is necessary to the perfection of the individual and to the Church as a body, the mystical body of Christ.

I. Contemplation is an act. The quietists and false mystics would have it otherwise, but in this lies their error. "Truth is the repose of the intellect," but this repose is not inactive and without result. There are no exterior acts but interior ones are not wanting and speculation itself is the most noble action of the intelligence. As we have said, it is not an idle gaze but an absorbing one, and the absorbing of the Deity is the transformation or deification of the soul. St. Thomas distinctly says that mystical union cannot be called the prelude of eternal beatitude except when it is obtained by the *action* of the powers of the soul. The word passive as applied to contemplation deceives many, but rightly understood it is only a relative term to distinguish the more receptive from the more active operations of the soul in prayer. The soul is passive because the action of God is overwhelming, but in its most passive state the soul gives itself to God as actively and freely as God gives Himself to the soul, according to the words of Bossuet; or as Clement of Alexandria expresses it: "Man predestines God as God predestines man." This is also the teaching in clear terms of St. John of the Cross, the incontestable authority in mystical theology.

God is in eternal action. The Father beholding Himself begets the Son. Here is action at its fountain head. Here is the norm. Our every look must beget God in us or it is an empty gaze, the vacant stare of the fool. So it is that fruit is the test of contemplation. The solid virtues must give evidence of God present in the soul or the gaze is condemned as empty. The activity of contemplation is difficult to conceive, for in this life we always associate action with effort, and so it often happens that the soul, unconscious of effort, fears inertia and becomes the prey of a thousand terrors, whereas it should be at peace, praising God that it has been permitted to know the unconscious action (none the less potent) of the better life, where, as with the angels, activity is repose. The powers of the soul move easily and naturally in the presence of the Deity. The Child is at home in its Father's house, knowing not the strangeness of the wayfarer or the constraint of the guest of one day. The very unconsciousness of action may be the truest evidence of a healthy soul, as it certainly is of a healthy body. We need not sigh for the pangs of indigestion in the assimilation of our food. If we find ourselves strong for the duties of life we may suppose that we are well nourished though we may have felt nothing of the chemical changes wrought in us. So the soul in the stillness of Contemplation, feeding upon the Godhead, may be wholly unconscious of what is taking place within it, but simply knows that what was once difficult to perform is now as nothing because of a strength acquired by the intuitive gaze of love.

As science is becoming more sensitive and alert in its search into the mysteries of nature, it is learning of a cosmic force born in the midst of a silence and apparent stillness that would have failed to arrest the attention of minds in the past. The nursery tale of the man who heard the grass grow is not without its lesson. There is real action in that silent growth, real music in that transformation of the sunlight into the blade beneath our feet, though few ears are fine enough to catch it, and so it is only the trained ear of the mystic that can catch the vibration of the Spirit in Contemplation, can note the weaving of the light of the Godhead into the fabric of this earthly existence by which the only true growth is accomplished.

In Isaiah we read: "Seraphim stabant et volabant," "the Seraphim stand and fly," a contradiction in terms surely, and only to be explained by the fixedness of divine Contemplation whereby the spirit flies to God with a rapidity earth may not know. A faint image is seen in the eagle poised in midair with pinions outstretched and apparently as motionless as the sun upon which his gaze is fixed. He is held in air by a rapidity of motion beyond the power of the human eye to perceive. Contemplation then is not idleness; it is the intensity of action or it is false and nothing worth.

II. Contemplation is the highest act of man, for it anticipates the action of the blessed in heaven. Creation is composed of spirit and matter. The Angels are pure spirits, the universe is matter; between them stands forth man, lifted above the brute creation by his reason and made a little less than the Angels by his corporeal existence. In him we distinguish the inferior and superior nature. The terms express the relation of lower and higher. Contemplation has to do entirely with the superior faculties of the intelligence which man shares in common with the angels who are pure intelligences; therefore it elicits the highest acts of which man's nature is capable. In defending Mary our Lord said: "She hath chosen the better part and it shall not be taken from her." That which is eternal is above that which is of time as the heavens are above the earth. The "many things" of earth that absorbed the troubled attention of Martha will pass away when the earth is folded up as a garment. Medicine ceases with the grave. Astronomy fades with the stars that fall from heaven. Geology melts with the rocks on the last dread day, the naturalist must feel the earth slip through his fingers. Even Moral Theology ceases its inquisition when the hydra-headed monster, sin, is no more, and Dogma needs not its formula when Truth appears, divinely simple; but the face of Jesus that held the gaze of Mary is eternal and it shall not be taken from her. She has begun to do in time what she is to continue through

unending ages. She has found Him whom her soul loveth, she will hold Him and she will not let Him go until she bring Him into the house of the Mother that bore her. Not into the unstable tent of human speculation, raised for a night in this land of exile, but into the home of Divine Wisdom, the Mother of the Contemplative, a home not builded by hands, that lifts its unshaken columns unto the Eternal City of God. There the ministrations of Martha are no longer needed, the victims are slain, the wine is mingled, Mary has but to taste the plenty of the Lord. Verily she hath chosen the better part (optimam) and it shall not be taken from her. Few words are needed here, for Truth hath spoken and in one word expressed all.

III. Contemplation is useful. This statement cannot fail to rouse the antagonism of the materialist who measures utility by dollars and cents, by massive piles of architecture or by ever increasing statistics. Such minds are of the earth earthy. They must see, feel, touch and taste a substantial good or deny its existence. They know nothing of the spirit, of the interior senses; they would discover the soul of a man with the X-ray, or rob him of his belief. The riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God are as dross in their sight, and to them the proofs of Scripture are of no worth; but to the Christian this evidence in favor of the utility of Contemplation as a power in the world is overwhelming. The figure of Moses on the mountain is trite, but it is too apt to pass over in silence. We read in Exodus that when the Israelites fought against Amalec, Moses went up on to the mountain to pray, and that when his hands were lifted up Israel overcame and if he let them down Amalec was victorious. What a lesson for the materialist! Who, beholding the most valiant of Israel in the trappings of war, with horses and chariots, and spearmen and lances, and the cry of battle rousing their every energy for the combat, would believe that their victory depended not upon *their* prowess, but upon the lifted arms of an aged man too feeble to uphold his own frame, kneeling far above them on the mountain, his eyes fixed, not upon their feats of arms, but upon the heavens above, whence he drew strength for the combat: "hi in curribus et hi in equis: nos autem in nomine Domini," etc. It was at the prayer of Elias, the father and model of contemplatives, that the fire descended from heaven to consume the holocaust. Human activity prepares the victim, lays the stones, pours the water and then ceases. It is the prayer of Contemplation that kindles a fire in God and draws from heaven the divine spark, the resistless flame that transforms the altar, the victim, the very stones into a kindred flame springing from earth to heaven and giving victory and glory to the people of God above their enemies.

Elias was a typical contemplative. Dwelling alone on his solitary mountain, he stood up as a fire in the divine Presence and burned his life out for the glory of God and the salvation of his people. Behold his power: he opened and closed the heavens; ruled the destinies of kings; plunged nations into famine and restored them to plenty; was master of life and death. Such is the power of Contemplation by which man shares in the divine attributes and perfections, putting on the strength of God Himself. Life is a warfare. The soul of every man is a field of contending forces. Perhaps it is for this reason that God has permitted so many of the records of war to come down to us in the inspired writings. He wishes to teach us the tactics of the spiritual combat, and we invariably find that the controlling power is prayer. In the holy war of the Machabees the people were armed, "not with defense of shield and spear," but with "exhortations, and the vision of Onias, a good and virtuous man, holding up his hands in prayer for them," and Jeremias "admirable for age and glory environed with great beauty and majesty praying much for the people and for the holy city," and when they encountered the foe "it was while calling upon God by prayer;" so fighting with their hands, but calling upon God in their hearts they went to victory.

When schism rent the Jewish camp and the sons of Core stood up in defiance of authority, "a blameless man made haste to pray for the people, and bringing forth the shield of his ministry, prayer, and by incense making supplication, withstood the wrath and put an end to the calamity." Prayer puts fetters on Omnipotence. How often do we find these mysterious words of the Creator to His creatures, "pray *not* for this people that I may destroy them." He cannot strike when the hands of the just are lifted up before Him.

St. Augustine in his magnificent eulogy of the monks shows his appreciation of their life when he says: "I shall not speak of those who, hidden in deserts from the eyes of men, enjoy the consideration of the God who has captivated their affections, and taste in the Contemplation of His beauty the happiness reserved to the saints alone."

According to the judgment of certain persons, these deserters from the world have separated themselves too completely from human affairs, but we do not appreciate how *useful* to us by their prayers and by the example of their lives are these souls whose bodies we no longer see. It would be superfluous to discuss the point, the fact is evident, and sanctity so eminent excites our admiration and homage by its brilliancy alone. Our words would add nothing to it. Blosius declares that a soul united to God is *useful* to the entire Church. "Anima Deo pure unita toti Ecclesiae est utilissima." And the utility of a soul in the Church is exactly

in proportion to its degree of union with God. St. John of the Cross teaches this when he says: "One instant of pure love of God is more profitable to the Church than all good works together, though it may seem as if nothing were done." And again he says clearly: "The closer the union with God, the greater the work accomplished." St. Augustine says, "where there is nothing, there is God." The life of the true contemplative is a supernatural life growing out of the destruction of every foreign element, every admixture of self, every material alloy, so that the soul in its base simplicity, its nothingness, may be one with the simplicity of God, and where God is there is power. "Blessed is the soul that loves," cries out St. John of the Cross, "for it has made a captive of God who obeys its good pleasure."

After considering the utility of Contemplation as a power, let us consider its utility as an instrument—a means to an end. God needs no instrument. He can act directly now as when, before the creation of the world, He had no tool save His Omnipotence; but having created instruments, it is His will to use them, and it is not for man to ask why. His will is His law, and we have only to bow. Christ has said: "The Father worketh and I work." Christ is the head of the mystical body and all its members *must* work with Him in God. We find many examples of the dependence of the Creator upon the action of the creature. When the Master looked over the fields white to harvest He said: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers." "Pray!" Did not the Father know the need; why did He wait for prayer to move Him to action? Inscrutable mystery only to be explained by the surpassing love of a God, who would lift His creatures to the dignity of co-workers with Him in the marvels of Redemption. If it be true that the Father waits for prayer to send forth laborers, it is equally true that without prayer the fields will grow dry and sere beneath the blaze of Divine wrath and never know the saving touch of the reaper. O the responsibility of man for his fellow man! If that be not a plea for the utility of prayer, can one be found to move the unthinking hearts of men? The figure of this apostolic instrumentality of Contemplation is found in Isaias, where we read of the seraph who took with tongs a live coal from the altar of God to cleanse the lips of the prophet. By prayer the contemplative carries fire from the face of God to touch the lips of the priest. God needed not the seraph or the tongs, but He hath made His angels ministers and He hath made souls His ministers as well, and it is His will to use them.

The Apostle recognized this when he said: "Praying withal for us, that God may open unto us a door of speech to speak the mystery of Christ." Prayer is the key that opened the door, closed

without it. It is true God is Master and can enter through closed doors, but He does not. He stands and knocks; the key is in our hands. Again, the Apostle exhorts to "prayer and watching, with all instance and supplication for all the saints and for *me*, that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence to make known the mystery of the Gospel." Here is the apostolic utility of Contemplation as a means to the extension of the Kingdom of God.

St. Thomas, the Angel of the Schools, tells us that in difficulties of Scripture he gave himself to prayer. Prayer was the bridge that spanned the chasm between his finite intellect and the infinite wisdom of God. It was the sure means to an end according to the words of Ecclesiasticus: "I have sought for wisdom openly in my prayer."

IV. Contemplation is not only useful, it is more. It is necessary. A thing may be called necessary when no other thing will supply its place and when it is the only possible means to a desired end. The necessity of Contemplation to the perfection of man's being is proven indirectly from his very nature. Being lifted above the animals by his intellective faculties, it is necessary to the perfection of his being that he use these faculties and not bury them in the earth of his lower nature, according to Aristotle (10 Ethics, c. 718). This agrees well with the words of St. Gregory in his homily on the talents. The one talent which stands alone is intellect, that *one* more than embracing all the others. Woe to the servant who, digging in the earth, hides it in fear. Exterior darkness is his portion, and those who, having five talents, received less than he, receive also the light that he refused. His one talent was *necessary* to his salvation.

Seneca speaks as a Christian as well as a philosopher when he makes a magnificent act of thanksgiving to God, not only for having made him to overcome the monsters of his passions, but for having admitted him to the most intimate mysteries of nature, and of the heavens, and to the contemplation of the Divinity. The philosophers went further, they thought that the happiness of this life lies in the perfect contemplation of the most excellent intelligible object, that is to say of God. Aristotle affirms this positively, and he gives the reason that, according to the confession of philosophers, the natural happiness of the present life should consist in the most perfect act of the intelligence, which a reasonable and intellectual creature can bring to bear on its last natural end—which is God. This agrees perfectly with the teaching of theologians, who affirm that there is in Purgatory a peculiar pain called languor, which is inflicted upon those who have not sufficiently hungered for the con-

templation of the vision of God in this life. Is this not proof that it is *necessary* to the perfection of man's nature that he develop these higher faculties here below, for were he perfect he could at once enter the Divine Presence? When a man dies he is not radically changed. He is perfected and alas! too often he has to await a long development. Gerson maintains that the life of a reasonable creature lies chiefly in the action of the intelligence; therefore one can say that contemplatives alone have life, because they alone take the food and drink that gives it, while others, like brutes, do not lift up their souls to things above. They alone have a complete life who seek this nourishment in Contemplation. In other words, it is necessary to their development, they are imperfect, immature, "infants of a hundred years," without it. A man may have all natural perfections of beauty and grace, may be a Solon of earthly wisdom, but if the spirit within him be not alive by intercourse with his Creator, he is an undeveloped being, a sepulchre of death. The necessity of Contemplation is indicated by the practice of the Church in establishing contemplative orders from time immemorial. The Church is the organ of the Holy Spirit. Her economy is divine. She cannot suffer an unnecessary encumbrance. Through all the ages as needs arose, orders arose to fill them. Devoted men and women were ready to give their labors and their lives at the call of their fellow beings or of the Church. The need ceased and the order melted away and disappeared, save for the stars that lingered in the firmament of the saints. What is the action of the Church to-day in regard to contemplative orders? Does she look upon them as effete and withdraw from them her favors, hastening their destruction? Nay, she hears the voice of her Spouse: "You are to pray always and not to faint," and hence her action in regard to the contemplative is that of the merchant who has found the treasure. She guards her pearl of price, builds walls about it, puts upon them bulwarks of silver, sets seven watchmen upon them, makes laws, promulgates censures, lavishes blessings; all to guard and keep the life of prayer in her heart of hearts. Would this be her action, with the multiplied needs of suffering humanity clamoring in her ears, did she not realize the *necessity* of unremitting prayer and praise? God has rights. The world spurns them. His Spouse, the Church, recognizes them and gives Him what He demands, unceasing homage. The undivided and enraptured attention of love.

Contemplative prayer is necessary in the Church for the salvation of innumerable souls, who may be reached in no other way. There are souls upon earth at this moment who have no channel of grace open to them save the prayer of the contemplative. Prayer, it must be remembered, is a distinct channel of grace for souls. The

sacraments are aqueducts of divine life, flowing out of Paradise, but what of those souls who have not the sacraments and whose hearts are closed by sin to the action of vivifying grace. Souls dead to God and buried in the grave of their own passions, so that even the zeal of an apostle is appalled at the mere thought of resurrection and cries out with Martha in dismay. Mary is silent, but she looks at Jesus and He weeps and cries out: "Lazarus come forth."

There are regions in the dark continent ruled by diabolic power. Horrors exist that cannot be thought of without a shudder. Are those innumerable multitudes of souls, far out of the reach of the most intrepid missionary, to be lost to the Church forever? Hear the voice of the Master: "This kind can be cast out *only* by prayer and fasting." The prayer of the contemplative is then a *necessity* in the Church of God.

Once again let us look upon Mary at the Feet of Jesus, and let us hear Him say: "One thing is necessary." This "one thing" is necessary to all men in a greater or lesser degree. Some have made it their *all*, and we have tried to show the nobility, the utility and the necessity of their action in the Church, for (and here we are brought back to our opening sentence) by Contemplation man is united to God, so as to participate in the highest degree in the Divine attributes and perfections. The Face of Jesus is the expression of the Divinity, "he that seeth Me seeth the Father;" the beholding of the Divinity is the transformation or deification of the soul; the operations of the soul transformed in God, "are the operations of the Holy Ghost, and consequently Divine." and of infinite value to the Church of God.

THE TWO STABATS.

I. THE SPECIOSA.

THE *Stabat Mater dolorosa* and its imitation (or parody, as some hymnologists are inclined to call it), the *Stabat Mater speciosa*, are companion pieces of not a little interest to the student of mediæval hymnody. They are vivid paintings of the Manger and the Cross, of Bethlehem and Golgotha. Using the same metrical and stanzaic form, and couched in almost identical phraseology, they treat of themes differing from each other by the whole range of human emotion and religious sentiment; and each is nevertheless found to be an adequate expression of the soul of the singer, and to possess an atmosphere appropriate to its subject. If

the *Stabat Mater speciosa* were read without reference to the other companion hymn, it would satisfy every requirement of the critical faculty; not, indeed, that it is perfect, like its companion hymn, but that whatever it lacks of perfection would probably escape notice if it were not contrasted with the absolute harmony and beauty of the other. In saying this, we are not taking account of the crudenesses of metre and rhymic defects which are so easily discerned in the *Speciosa:* for we assume that the text has come down to us considerably altered for the worse through the carelessness of the scribe or whatever other accidents may be involved in that "wreck of time" of which Bacon speaks, that *injuria temporum* which Cicero laments. It is quite obvious that some such hurtful influence has been at work defacing the hymn, for its occasional crudeness is not that of an inexpert workman, laboring heavily with his instruments, but that of a hasty copyist, dropping a syllable here and a whole word there, and perhaps interverting the stanzas and so unconsciously altering the rhymic scheme.

The two hymns have an added interest in the perplexing question of authorship. This question will be treated more fully in connection with each hymn; but it may be proper to remark in this place that the ascription of both hymns to Jacopo de' Benedetti, the "wise fool" of Todi, has given to hymnologists an opportunity, eagerly snatched, to rehearse the striking stories related by Luke Wadding of the extraordinary mediæval convert who passed "from the cloister to a prison, from the prison to the *cultus* of the altar." Ozanam devotes forty pages of his work on the Franciscan poets to a brilliant summary of his life, and fifty-five additional pages to a consideration of his writings. These are mostly Italian poems, indeed, although his reputed authorship of the Stabats doubtless served to throw over them a glamor of interest which otherwise they might have lacked. A more searching spirit of criticism inclines at the present day to the opinion that Jacopo (or Jacopone, the "big James," as his townsmen began to call him in derision after his assumed foolishness had ceased to be a nine-days' wonder) did not write any of the Latin poems so confidently ascribed to him. This critical doubt is perhaps a needless scepticism, for the *Cur mundus militat* has an unassailed tradition in its favor. Not so the Stabats; but hymnologists will not be eager to renounce an ascription which finds so much added flavor in the career of him who literally made himself a fool for Christ's sake. The present page could be enlivened very much by a judicious extraction from Ozanam or Wadding of the salient features of Jacopone's life, illustrated with choice instances of his saintly follies, his deep and tender mysticism, his political misadventures, his imprisonment, his prophecy of liberation,

his picturesque death, his *cultus* on the altars of his order. If, however, he be not the author of the Stabats, interest must give place to relevancy; and we refrain. One incident in his life should, nevertheless, be touched upon, if only for the reason that our separated brethren are apt to find in it a new opportunity for assailing the memory of Boniface the Eighth with fresh obloquy. For instance, Trench, who excludes from his collection both Stabats (and selects only the *Cur mundus militat)* because he cannot tolerate their language in reference to our Lady, has this to say: "The freedom with which, in his vernacular poems, Jacopone treated the abuses of his time, above all those of the hierarchy, drew on him long imprisonments, and he only went out of prison when his persecutor, Boniface the Eighth, whom to have had for an adversary was itself an honour, went in." Dr. Coles remarks, in the Proem to his translation of the Stabat: "Boniface VIII., who, prior to his elevation to the papal chair, had lived in friendly relations with Jacopone, having been deeply offended by some sharp censures directed against him, threw him into prison, at the same time suspended over him the excommunication." And Duffield continues the chapter of abuse as follows: "Jacoponus also interests us in view of his Protestant spirit. He never fancied Boniface VIII., and when that Pope had a dream in which he saw a great bell without a tongue, and consulted the keen-witted friar upon its meaning, he received the reproof valiant, 'Know, your holiness,' said the undaunted monk, 'that the great size of the bell signifies the pontifical power which embraces the world. But take heed lest the tongue be that good example which you will not give.' For this and other liberties which he took it is no wonder that he presently found himself in a prison, where he suffered everything patiently, and announced that he would go out when Boniface was ready to come in."

Now it is a pity that, in borrowing so much from Ozanam, these commentators did not place themselves further in his debt by digesting his explanation of the imprisonment of an unquestionably holy friar. The history of the Church shows us that occasionally good men have been found on a side which subsequent events, or a calm estimate of a distant period, will demonstrate as a wrong side. However much they erred in matters of fact, they were conscientious in their action. How Jacopone managed to array himself with interests alien to justice and correct obedience, is not illustrated by these commentators just quoted. Ozanam's omitted *rationale* of the transaction is therefore supplied here. Although it is not a very brief account, the tactics of some of our separated brethren render its insertion a matter of necessity. In the following account of the transaction, we shall partly condense and partly translate from Ozanam.

On his election to the papal chair, Boniface VIII. was everywhere recognized as a man of energetic character, profoundly versed in Canon and Civil Law. He was very clearly a statesman; but this fact seemed, perhaps, to offer some ground for a fear lest the instincts of a secular prince should consort but poorly with the gentle sway of the priest, and a canonist's respect for abstract justice should overshadow the claims of mercy. Perhaps, says Ozanam, apprehensions like these were filling the mind of Jacopone when, as it chanced, the Pope consulted him about a strange dream in which he saw a clapperless bell whose circumference enclosed the whole earth. The saintly friar interpreted the bell as the pontifical power, and the absence of the clapper as a warning to the Pope to give good example to his flock. The sinister presages seemed to be realized to the eyes of Jacopone when Boniface, revoking the concessions made by his predecessor to the party of stricter Franciscans (who had been allowed to separate themselves from their brethren of laxer observance), suppressed them as a distinct party and bade them return to obedience of their former superiors of the "Conventual" party. This was a heavy blow to the ardent reformers of the Franciscan Order; and it happened at a time when strange rumors were spreading to the effect that Boniface had extorted the abdication of Celestine V. and had confined him in a prison to die at the hands of tormentors. Now there was no truth in these rumors; but they were sown by discontent and reaped by credulity; and they led souls whom they deceived to ask whether such a man as Boniface should be considered the Vicar of Christ, and whether the abdication of Celestine were lawful. These questions were echoing from all parts of Italy, when, on the 10th of May, 1297, two enemies of the Pope, the Cardinals James and Peter Colonna, gathered a small number of their adherents in the castle of Lunghezza, near Rome, and dared solemnly to protest against Boniface as an usurper, appealing at the same time to the judgment of the next General Council. Dupuy gives the names of those who were present; and of the eight, five names are those of archdeacons or canons of Rheims, Rouen, Chartres, Embrun, Senlis. Ozanam thinks he can see in this fact a trace of the statecraft of Philip the Fair, whose agents are already seen conferring with the enemies of Boniface, long before the strife between the two had been signalized by deeds of violence. Jacopone's name appeared as a witness in the document drawn up, and of course he lay under the same excommunication as that which fell on the Colonnas and their party. He had been residing for three months in his convent at Palestrina, which fief was the principal stronghold of the Colonnas. It was in this hotbed of sedition that the vilest rumors sprung up and flourished; here it was that Jacopone

passed judgment on a question of such great importance. And so it happened that, by one of those illusions which God permits to humble the wisdom of man, the saintly friar who had won laurels in his worldly days in the domain of jurisprudence, who had atoned for his worldly life by the harshest penances, and who withal had fortified his mind by a study of theology, fell into error in a matter of supreme importance. Of the satire credited to him, with which he emphasized his mistake, doubtless a half was the after production of others, while its inspiration came from the Colonnas. But it raised up many enemies of Boniface, and rehearsed rumors that were found afterwards as items in the indictment drawn up against Boniface. Such a course of insubordination and of ecclesiastico-political satire, merited punishment when, in 1298, Boniface had reduced Palestrina to submission; and Jacopone expiated in prison a mistake which was doubtless one of the head rather than of the heart. Who shall say that Boniface acted unjustly in the matter? It may be granted, indeed, that however great the provocation, justice might well have been tempered with that mercy which has always been the distinguishing feature of papal activity. But who could gather from the words of Trench, or of Dr. Coles, or of the Rev. Mr. Duffield, that Boniface had had such heavy and long-continued provocation, and that the punishment meted out to Jacopone was legally a just one? One would fancy from their comment on the incident that the poor friar was thrown into prison for some little indiscretion of language or for a harmless satirical skit against the "abuses of the time, above all those of the hierarchy," or for "some sharp censures directed against" Boniface; and that, for some such genial utterances, the Pope was going about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour.

Now it may fairly be confessed that all this discussion cannot plead much relevancy to the subject of the *Stabat Mater*, whose authorship can be ascribed to several names with about as much probability as to that of Jacopone. But hymnologists have an amiable trick of swelling out their books with biographical notices (sometimes quite lengthy ones) of men for whose authorship of a hymn only a probable claim can be put forth. And so it happens that we are treated to biographies which are, indeed, interesting enough at times, but which only rarely have an obvious appropriateness in the account of a hymn of much-disputed authorship. As our readers have doubtless come across such biographical notices of Jacopone in connection with the *Stabat Mater*, we have allowed ourselves some space to correct one glaring injustice so apt to appear in them. We may now dismiss this subject with the following words of Ozanam: "The memory of Boniface VIII., unworthily calumniated, has been honor-

ably defended by Mgr. Wiseman *(Dublin Review,* XV. No. 22) and by Tosti *(Storia di Bonifazio VIII.).* . . . Mansi seems to me to have characterized Boniface with perfect impartiality: 'Ingentes animi dotes contulit, quanquam saeculari principatui quam ecclesiastico aptiores' *(Annal. Eccles.,* ad ann. 1303)."

Coming now to the *Stabat Mater dolorosa* and its companion hymn, we are confronted with the strongest possible witness to their poetical and hymnodal power in the fact that our separated brethren have devoted much attention to their worthy rendition into English verse, while at the same time inveighing harshly against their "Mariolatry." In commenting on the hymns, we shall gather some of these expostulatory tributes into their appropriate place for each hymn; but meanwhile it may be interesting here to note the attitude of Dr. Newman to the devotion of the Catholic heart towards our Lady. His confession, in the *Apologia,* of the strong bias he felt against the Church in this matter, and of the difficulty it placed in his pathway towards Catholicity, coupled with his continued dissent from the phraseology of Italian devotion towards the Blessed Virgin, which he felt even after his conversion, will perhaps teach us gentleness towards our mistaken critics. He says (Chap. iv., 2): "Now it must be observed that the writings of St. Alfonso, as I knew them by the extracts commonly made from them, prejudiced me as much against the Roman Church as anything else, on account of what was called their 'Mariolatry;' but there was nothing of the kind in this book [The "Sermons" of St. Alphonsus]. I wrote to ask Dr. Russell whether anything had been left out in the translation; he answered that there certainly were omissions in one Sermon about the Blessed Virgin. This omission, in the case of a book intended for Catholics, at least showed that such passages as are found in the works of Italian Authors were not acceptable to every part of the Catholic world. Such devotional manifestations in honour of our Lady had been my great *crux* as regards Catholicism; I say frankly, I do not fully enter into them now; I trust I do not love her the less, because I cannot enter into them. They may be fully explained and defended; but sentiment and taste do not run with logic: they are suitable for Italy, but they are not suitable for England. But, over and above England, my own case was special; from a boy I had been led to consider that my Maker and I, His creature, were the two beings, luminously such, *in rerum natura.* I will not here speculate, however, about my own feelings. Only this I know full well now, and did not know then, that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, material or immaterial, no dogmatic symbol, no rite, no sacrament, no Saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator. It is face to face, "solus

cum solo," in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates; He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go to death; in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude. . . . The devotions then to Angels and Saints as little interfered with the incommunicable glory of the Eternal, as the love which we bear our friends and relations, our tender human sympathies, are inconsistent with that supreme homage of the heart to the Unseen, which really does but sanctify and exalt, not jealously destroy, what is of earth."

This last sentence of Dr. Newman seems to have anticipated the very words of Dr. Coles' objection to the Stabat: "Not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her." "The devotion then to Angels and Saints," says Newman, "as little interfered with the incommunicable glory of the Eternal, as the love which we bear our friends and relations, our tender human sympathies, are inconsistent with that supreme homage of the heart to the Unseen, which really does but sanctify and exalt, not jealously destroy, what is of earth." Is the exegesis a fair one, which measures the language of devotion with a foot-rule? which applies mathematical tests to the tender outpourings of love?

The words of Dr. Newman will serve to illustrate the general mental attitude of the non-Catholic world towards the warm outpourings of Catholic devotion. And yet the very motto of Cardinal Newman—"the heart speaks to the heart," *Cor ad cor loquitur*—is perhaps the best vindication of our attitude toward the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, the instruments of the Passion, and the like, objected to by Protestant hymnologists. Dr. Trench voices the general complaint in the Preface to the first edition of his "Sacred Latin Poetry:" "The aim of the present volume is to offer to members of the English Church a collection of the best sacred Latin poetry, such as they shall be able entirely and heartily to accept and approve—a collection, that is, in which they shall not be evermore liable to have the current of their sympathies checked, by coming upon that, which, however beautiful as poetry, out of higher respects they must reject and condemn—in which, too, they shall not fear that snares are being laid for them, to entagle them unawares in admiration for aught which is inconsistent with their faith and fealty to their own spiritual mother. Such being the idea of the volume it is needless to say that all hymns which in any way imply the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation are excluded. In like manner all are excluded, which involve any creature worship, or which speak of the Mother of the Lord in any other language than that which scripture has sanctioned, and our Church adopted. So, too, all asking of the suffrages of the saints, all addresses to the Cross calcu-

lated to encourage superstition, that is, in which any value is attributed to the material wood in which it is used otherwise than in the Epistles of St. Paul, namely, as a figure of speech by which we ever and only understand Him that hung upon it; all these have been equally refused a place." Cardinal Wiseman, writing in 1842 on Catholic "Prayers and Prayer-books," complains that the English habit of praying only from the head had chilled the warmth of even the Catholic heart: "The so-called Reformation, wherever it fell, blighted all warmth and tenderness, and introduced a totally new system of prayer. . . . Now it has seemed to us as though some of the leaven which, while it fermented, soured the sweet bread of old devotion among our neighbors, had unfortunately slipped in among ourselves. . . . It appears to us as though most of our modern English prayers came too much from the head. Not that the heart was wanting in those who composed them—far are we from thinking so; but they feared to let it play; they put it in fetters, they bound up its feelings too much, lest they should turn imprudent. The consequence is, that they bear a certain reasoning, argumentative air, that smacks of a sadly controversial age. If we may venture to use such a phrase, we *memorialize* the Almighty, instead of praying to Him."

The frigid example of Trench was followed by other translators of the hymns, who, however, were for the most part too much overcome by the beauty of the hymns to exclude them from their collections, and were content to let them pass with a protest ranging through the whole diapason of a cold piety, from a polite disclaimer to downright abuse, but nearly always with an obvious misconception of the Catholic doctrine and Catholic attitude towards the themes of the hymns. While Newman "could not enter into" the language of merely unliturgical and private Italian devotion, and was not speaking at all of the liturgical prayers and hymns of the Church, the Protestant objectors warily search for passages in the liturgical hymns, which might yield to a laborious criticism some points for disclaimer or abuse. Dr. Coles, for instance, cannot refrain from translating the *Stabat Mater dolorosa;* but, although he was not a divine, but a physician, he utters his protest in part as follows: "Not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her. Her agency is invoked as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal. Plainly it is the province of the Holy Ghost, and not of any creature, to 'work in us to will and to do;' to effect spiritual changes; to 'take of the things of Christ and show them unto us,'—and yet these are the very things which she herself is asked to accomplish for the suppliant. 'Fac,' alone, aside from potential equivalents, is used at least nine times—

a form of expression manifestly inappropriate unless addressed to one capable of acts causal and original and therefore divine. Not content, it seems, with making her a fountain of supernatural influence, a succedaneum of the Holy Ghost, her efficiency is extended to the performance likewise of the work assigned to the Son—

Per te, Virgo, sim defensus
In die Judicii,—

an expression of reliance on her rather than on Him to ward off in that day the demandsof divine justice. Mariolatry here culminates. It could not well be carried farther."

It is good to know the worst word of our objectors; and there is much reason to fear that the lawyerlike pleading of Dr. Coles does in truth represent the unspoken view of very many Protestants. But what shall we say to such a wooden exegesis? The Russian nobleman of Dr. Newman's lecture would seem to be the clearest possible rejoinder. That nobleman, in the ingenious parable of Newman, had come across a copy of "Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England," and after diligent perusal was prepared to speak on the "atheistical tenets and fiendish maxims of John-Bullism." His audience listens with bated breath to the argument: "Now I should say, gentlemen, that this book . . . is . . . of judges, and lawyers, and privy councillors, and justices of the peace, and police magistrates, and clergy, and country gentlemen, the guide, and I may say, the gospel. I open the book, gentlemen, and what are the first words which meet my eyes? 'The King can do no wrong.' I beg you to attend, gentlemen, to this most significant assertion; one was accustomed to think that no child of man had the gift of impeccability; one had imagined that, simply speaking, impeccability was a divine attribute; but this British Bible, as I may call it, distinctly ascribes an absolute sinlessness to the King of Great Britain and Ireland. . . . But this is far from all: the writer goes on actually to ascribe to the Sovereign (I tremble while I pronounce the words) *absolute perfection;* for he speaks thus: 'The law ascribes to the King in his political capacity *absolute perfection;* the *King can do no wrong.* . . . The King, moreover, is not only incapable of doing wrong, but even of *thinking* wrong!! *he can never do an improper thing; in him is no folly or weakness!!!*' . . . The English Sovereign distinctly claimed, according to the same infamous work, to be the '*fount* of justice.' . . . The Queen, a woman, only did acts of reparation and restitution as a matter of *grace!* . . . All his hearers knew perfectly well that nature was one thing, grace another; and yet here was a poor child of clay claiming to be the fount, not only of justice, but of grace. She was making herself a

first cause of not merely natural, but spiritual excellence, and doing nothing more or less than simply emancipating herself from her Maker." This is but a part of the zealous nobleman's indictment against the British Constitution. He is made by Newman to speak in the logic which is used by Dr. Coles; indeed, one might almost fancy that Newman was prophetically anticipating the very words and argument of Coles. The "she" of Newman is Queen Victoria; the "she" of Coles is the Blessed Virgin. "Her agency is invoked," says Coles, "as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal." Similarly did Newman's Russian Count speak of Queen Victoria: "She was making herself a first cause of not merely natural, but spiritual excellence, and doing nothing more or less than simply emancipating herself from her Maker."

Newman's long allegory or parable is something more than pleasant banter; it is really a profound analysis of the objections of Protestant hymnologists to our Catholic mediæval hymns. But to answer Dr. Coles, not by a parable, but by frigid logic, it needs but to deny his calm assertion that "fac" is "a form of expression manifestly inappropriate unless addressed to one capable of acts causal and original and therefore divine." It is used a hundred times a day in ordinary language with a connotation entirely different from that to which Coles would restrict it. It is surely needless to encumber the statement of such a fact with the obvious illustrations so familiar to any one who will review his own words, or the words of others. There is simply no "Mariolatry" in the grand hymn, save to a mind such as the Russian Count possessed: "If the Queen 'cannot do wrong,' if she 'cannot even think wrong,' if she is 'absolute perfection,' if she has 'no folly, no weakness,' if she is the 'fount of justice,' if she is the 'fount of grace,' if she is simply 'above law,' if she is 'omnipotent,' what wonder that the lawyers of John-Bullism should also call her 'sacred!' what wonder that they should speak of her as 'majesty!' what wonder that they should speak of her as a 'superior being!' Here again I am using the words of the book I hold in my hand. 'The people' (my blood runs cold while I repeat them) 'are led to consider their Sovereign in the light of a superior being.' "

Before treating the Stabats separately,[1] it should prove acceptable to print them in parallel columns for the purpose of comparison. Although the Speciosa was apparently moulded on the Dolorosa, it will be found able to stand as a substantive, rather than merely an accidental, hymn; for the expression of joy seems to be quite adequate, and the vividness of the scene-painting fully satisfying.

[1] The Speciosa will be considered in the present paper, and the Dolorosa in a succeeding issue.

THE DOLOROSA.	THE SPECIOSA.
(Parallel verses from various texts.)	(Slightly rearranged for comparison.)
Stabat mater dolorosa Juxta crucem lacrimosa, Dum pendebat filius; Cuius animam gementem, Contristatam et dolentem, Pertransivit gladius.	Stabat mater speciosa Juxta foenum gaudiosa, Dum jacebat filius; Cuius animam gaudentem, Laetabundam ac ferventem, Pertransivit jubilus.
O quam tristis et afflicta Fuit illa benedicta Mater Unigeniti! Quae moerebat et dolebat Pia mater, dum videbat Nati poenas inclyti.	O quam laeta et beata Fuit illa immaculata Mater Unigeniti! Quae gaudebat et ridebat, Exsultabat, cum videbat Nati partum inclyti.
Quis est homo qui non fleret, Matrem Christi si videret In tanto supplicio? Quis non posset contristari, Christi matrem contemplari Dolentem cum filio?	Quišnam est qui non gauderet Matrem Christi si videret In tanto solatio? Quis non posset collaetari, Christi matrem contemplari Ludentem cum filio?
Pro peccatis suae gentis Vidit Jesum in tormentis Et flagellis subditum; Vidit suum dulcem natum Moriendo desolatum, Dum emisit spiritum.	Pro peccatis suae gentis Christum vidit cum jumentis, Et algori subditum; Vidit suum dulcem natum Vagientem, adoratum, Vili diversorio.
(No parallel verses to be found in any known text of the *Stabat mater dolorosa.*)	Nato Christo in praesepe, Coeli cives canunt laete Cum immenso gaudio; Stabat senex cum puella, Non cum verbo nec loquela, Stupescentes cordibus.
Eia mater, fons amoris, Me sentire vim doloris Fac ut tecum lugeam; Fac ut ardeat cor meum In amando Christum Deum, Ut sibi complaceam.	Eia mater, fons amoris, Me sentire vim ardoris, Fac ut tecum sentiam; Fac, ut ardeat cor meum In amando Christum Deum, Ut sibi complaceam.
Sancta mater, istud agas: Crucifixi fige plagas Cordi meo valide; Tui nati vulnerati, Tam dignati pro me pati, Poenas mecum divide.	Sancta mater, istud agas: Parvi introducas plagas, Cordi meo valide; Tui nati coelo lapsi, Jam dignati foeno nasci, Poenas mecum divide.
Fac me vere tecum flere, Crucifixo condolere, Donec ego vixero;	Fac me vere congaudere, Jesulino cohaerere, Donec ego vixero;

Juxta crucem tecum stare
Et me tibi sociare
In planctu desidero.

In me sistat dolor tui,
Crucifixo fac me frui,
Dum sum in exilio;
Hunc dolorem fac me moestum,
Nec me facias alienum
Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara;
Fac me tecum plangere;
Fac ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem,
Et plagas recolere.

Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Fac me cruce inebriari,
Et cruore filii.
Inflammatus et accensus,
Per te, Virgo, sim defensus
In die iudicii.

Fac me cruce custodiri,
Morte Christi praemuniri,
Confoveri gratia.
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animae donetur
Paradisi gloria.

(No parallel verses to be found.)

Juxta stramen tecum stare
Et me tibi sociare
In foeno desidero.

In me sistat ardor tui;
Puerino fac me frui
Dum sum in exilio.
Hunc ardorem fac communem;
Ne me facias immunem
Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara;
Fac me parvum rapere:
Fac ut portem pulchrum, fortem
Qui nascendo vicit mortem,
Volens vitam tradere.

Fac me tecum satiari,
Nato tuo inebriari,
Stantem in tripudio.
Inflammatus et accensus,
Obstupescit omnis sensus
Tali de commercio.

Fac me nato custodiri,
Verbo Dei praemuniri,
Conservari gratia:
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animae donetur
Tui nati visio.

Omnes stabulum amantes
Et pastores vigilantes
Pernoctantes sociant:
Per virtutem nati tui
Ora ut electi sui
Ad patriam veniant.

To make the comparison closer, as well as to remedy some obvious and unnecessary crudenesses in metre and rhyme, the text of the *Speciosa* just given has been amended according to the suggestions of various critics. The emendations will be considered in connection with the comment on the hymn itself, which now follows.

STABAT MATER SPECIOSA.

The title of the Hymn immediately suggests the other more famous one, *Stabat Mater dolorosa*, and would naturally lead a reader to expect some similarity between the hymns as well in structure as in thought. A close comparison of the two will, however, surprise

him with an almost complete identity of phrase as well as of stanzaic form; e. g.:

MATER SPECIOSA.	MATER DOLOROSA.
Stabat Mater speciosa,	Stabat Mater dolorosa,
Juxta foenum gaudiosa,	Juxta crucem lacrymosa
Dum jacebat Parvulus;	Dum pendebat Filius;
Cujus animam gaudentem,	Cujus animam gementem,
Laetabundam ac ferventem	Contristatam ac dolentem,
Pertransivit jubilus.	Pertransivit gladius.
O quam laeta et beata	O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa immaculata	Fuit illa benedicta
Mater Unigeniti:	Mater Unigeniti:
Quae gaudebat et ridebat,	Quae moerebat et dolebat
Exultabat, cum videbat	Et tremebat, cum videbat
Nati partum inclyti.	Nati poenas inclyti.

And so the close imitation continues throughout, with two exceptions; namely, the 5th and 13th stanzas, which have no counterpart in the *Mater dolorosa.*

I. AUTHORSHIP.

The question immediately arises: Which hymn was composed first? Which was the original, which is the imitation? The competent and learned French scholar, A. F. Ozanam, who was the first to call attention to the *Mater Speciosa,* concluded that both were by the same author, Jacoponus de Benedictis, whose title to the composition of the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* he seemed to consider unquestioned. The Anglican hymnologist, Dr. J. M. Neale, added to this the supposition that the "Speciosa" preceded the "Dolorosa."

As the first lines of the hymns differ only in the last word, the title "Speciosa" may serve to indicate the hymn under consideration now, while that of "Dolorosa" may be taken to describe the other.

An edition of the Italian poems of Jacopone, published in 1495 at Brescia, contained both hymns in Latin; but so thoroughly had the immense popularity, and withal, very superior merit, of the *Dolorosa* eclipsed the *Speciosa,* that this latter fell into almost complete oblivion, until it was rediscovered by the historian of the Franciscan Poets, A. F. Ozanam, and by him transcribed from a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, and printed in his *Les Poëtes Franciscains en Italie au Treizième Siècle,,* Paris, 1852. Ozanam thought it had never been published before: "Je crois le *Stabat Mater Speciosa* encore inédit" (Œuvres Complètes, Vol. V., p. 183). His delight at his discovery may be imagined from his comment on both hymns. Speaking first of the *Dolorosa* he says *inter alia:*

"Cette œuvre incomparable suffirait à la gloire de Jacopone: mais en même temps que le *Stabat* du Calvaire, il avait voulu composer le *Stabat* de la crèche, où paraissait la Vierge mère dans toute la joie de l'enfantement. Il l'écrivit sur les mêmes mesures et sur les mêmes rimes; tellement qu'on pourrait douter un moment lequel fut le premier, du chant de douleur ou du chant d'allégresse. Cependant, la postérité a fait un choix entre ces deux perles semblables; et, tandis qu'elle conservait l'une avec amour, elle laissait l'autre enfouie. Je crois le *Stabat Mater speciosa* encore inédit; et, quand j'essaye d'en traduire quelques strophes, je sens s'échapper l'intraduisible charme de la langue, de la mélodie, et de la naïveté antique" (ib., p. 183). He then gives a prose version of some of the stanzas.

All this occurs in his Essay on Jacopone, and is a clear intimation that he believes both to have been composed *en même temps*, and that the *Speciosa* was modeled upon the *Dolorosa*: Il l'écrivit sur les mêmes mesures et sur les mêmes rimes.

Dr. Neale closed his long and able devotion to Mediæval Hymnology by introducing the *Speciosa*, with a translation, to the English reading public shortly before his death (1866). Neale, like Ozanam, ascribes the poem to Jacopone. Dr. Schaff (*Literature and Poetry*, p. 222) differs from this view: "This is improbable. A poet would hardly write a parody on a poem of his own. That man must be exceedingly vain who would make himself a model for imitation; and Jacopone was so humble that he forgot himself and went to the extreme of ascetic self-abnegation." The *Speciosa* is not so finished a poem as the *Dolorosa*, and is marred by some imperfect rhyme. Neale therefore concluded that it was an early attempt at Sequence-writing by a man who was beginning to form his hand to an exacting labor. In that case we should have to consider the *Dolorosa* as an imitation of the *Speciosa*—a hypothesis which Schaff cannot accept for a moment. The latter, with all its imperfections on its head, could scarce have served as a model for so flawless a poem as the *Dolorosa*. Besides this, Schaff calls attention to the fact that "the opening of the *Stabat Mater (dolorosa)* was borrowed from the Latin Bible (John xix., 25), with reference to Mary at the Cross, but not at the Cradle. The sixth line, 'pertransivit gladius,' may have suggested 'pertransivit jubilus,' but not *vice versa*. . . . The passion hymn soon became popular and passed into public worship; but the Christmas hymn had no such good luck. It is the fame of an original which invites imitation." He therefore concludes that "the author of the *Mater Speciosa* belonged probably to the Franciscan Order, but lived and wrote after Jacopone, when the *Mater Dolorosa* was already well known and widely used. This fact best explains also the enlargement and the supernumerary lines of the

eighth stanza. The *Mater Speciosa* wants the last finish, while the *Mater Dolorosa* is perfect. The very reason which Dr. Neale urges for the priority of the former, proves its posteriority."

The opinion of Schaff is echoed by Dr. Coles: "Ingenious and exact as is the parallel, it is easy enough to see which was first and which was second. If twins, the *Mater Dolorosa* must have been the elder. It is impossible that 'Pertransivit jubilus' was written before 'Pertransivit gladius.' But we doubt, we confess, a simultaneous birth, or even a common parentage."

II. COMMENT.

Like many other Latin hymns, these two *Stabats* seem to possess the subtle power of melting the hearts of those who are most averse to veneration of the *Mater*, whether *dolorosa* or *speciosa*. Thus Dr. Coles confesses to both feelings, attraction and aversion: "That the new found *Stabat* is not wanting in those qualities which have attracted to its illustrious prototype the admiring regards of men through so many generations, testifies to the skill of the writer. The structural correspondence betwen the two is kept up throughout. Grief and anguish are seen to go hand in hand, singing as they go, to the same sweet time and measure. Were it only poetry and not prayer—mere apostrophe and not religious homage—we would be content; but alas! there clings to one and the other the fatal taint of idolatry; and we are not permitted to wink out of sight so unspeakable an offense against the purity of the unshared worship of the infinite Jehovah." More kindly and more gentle is Dr. Schaff: "It is a parallelism of contrast which runs from beginning to end. The *Mater Speciosa* is a Christmas hymn, and sings the overflowing joy of Mary at the cradle of the new-born Saviour. The *Mater Dolorosa* is a Good Friday hymn, and sings the piercing agony of Mary at the cross of her divine human Son. They breathe the same love to Christ, and the burning desire to become identified with Mary by sympathy in the intensity of her joy as in the intensity of her grief. They are the same in structure, and excel alike in the singularly touching music of language, and the soft cadence that echoes the sentiment. Both consist of two parts, the first of which describes the objective situation; the second identifies the author with the situation, and addresses the Virgin as an object of worship. Both bear the impress of their age and the monastic order which probably gave them birth. The mysterious charm and power of the two hymns are due to the subject and to the intensity of feeling with which the author seized it. Mary at the manger, and Mary at the cross, opens a vista to an abyss of joy and of grief such as the world never saw before. Mary stood there not only as the mother, but as

the representative of the whole Christian church, for which the eternal Son of God was born an infant in the manger, and for which He suffered the most ignominious death on the cross."

The great power of both poems probably lies in the fact that the author everywhere makes us see the manger and the cross through the eyes of the Blessed Mother who looked so close upon both. The poems are not merely epics which describe great events; not merely lyrics which voice the ardent emotion of the singer at contemplating the same events; but are at once descriptions and lyric cries—the pictures filling the imagination, the cries filling the heart. And in the intensity of the singer's emotion we are forced to share, drawn as by a spiritual magnet within the magic circle of his own joys and griefs. The Babe lying helpless in the manger, the Man hanging dead upon the cross—these cannot speak to us; but Mary is the living witness at both wondrous places. We can try to enter into her emotions, can smile and weep with her; and by the subtlest workings of sympathy, can be identified with her both at Bethlehem and at Calvary. This identification the author succeeds in effecting, and thence arises, we conceive, the real power and attractiveness of the two hymns. In his "Essay on Minor Rites and Ceremonies," Cardinal Wiseman developes this thought: "Surely," he says, "there is One, who had a share in these and all other such scenes, through whose eyes we should all be glad to view them, in whose heart we should long to feel them. If in the reflection upon another's soul we wish to view the occurrences—joyful, dolorous, or triumphant—through which mercy and glory were purchased for us, there is one 'Mirror of Justice,' bright, spotless, untarnished, which reflects them in their full clearness and truth. Shall we not strive to look upon it? If these events called up feelings in every spectator, in one breast alone they found depth, and breadth, and strength enough to do them full justice. Shall we not watch and study its heavings and powerful throes? The maternal heart alone could contain the ocean of bitterness, or the heaven of joy, which these various mysteries were fitted to create. And hence the natural desire of loving souls to be its associate, and to stand with its venerable possessor in sight of all that She saw, in hearing of all that She heard, in observance of all that She laid up in her heart.

Juxta { stramen / Crucem } tecum stare
Et me tibi sociare
In { foeno / planctu } desidero."

Cardinal Wiseman has here seized on the parallelism of contrast in the two hymns—similarity of form and phrase, and complete antithesis of theme and thought. Through the eyes of Mary we are to see Jesus, whether in the manger or on the cross. The joy of one scene and the sorrow of the other are antitheses of theme and thought, unified in the person of the Mother and presented to us in a unique form of stanza.

III. EMENDATIONS.

One would like to think that both *Stabats* were the work of a single pen; and, indeed, if the glaring imperfections of the technique (imperfections which should be credited, perhaps, to the negligence of the scribe to whom is due the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale) were removed by skilful conjecture and emendation, one might concede a common authorship to both poems. Ozanam's MS. is clearly imperfect. For instance, the first line of the third stanza runs:

Quis est qui non gauderet,

which lacks a syllable. The similar line in the *Dolorosa* is:

Quis est homo qui non fleret.

Schaff and Coles insert *jam:*

Quis jam est qui non gauderet.

Johann Kayser amends by adding the suffix *nam:*

Quisnam est qui non gauderet.

The second line of the seventh stanza reads:

Prone introducas plagas.

Ozanam questions *prone* with an added "(sic)," and Kayser amends by writing the line:

Parvi introducas plagas.

The second line of the ninth stanza seems in the MS. to be needlessly unrhythmical:

Ne facias me immunem;

and Kayser corrects by inverting as follows:

" Ne me facias immunem.

The fourth line of the tenth stanza gives the most difficulty; and Ozanam adds another "(sic)":

Fac ut portem pulchrum fantem *(sic)*,
Qui nascendo vicit mortem,
Volens vitam tradere.

Fantem does not rhyme with mortem; and Schaff suggests:

Fac, ut pulchrum fantem portem,
Qui nascendo vicit mortem,

and is faithfully followed by Coles and the editor of *Seven Great Hymns of the Mediæval Church.*

Koenigsfeld suggests:

Fac ut pulchrum infantem portem,

eliding for the sake of metre just as the poet himself does in his own line:

Fuit illa immaculata.

A much happier emendation, as it seems to us, is that of Kayser:

Fac ut portem pulchrum, fortem
Qui nascendo vicit mortem;

for not only is sense consulted for, but as well a perfect similarity with the appropriate lines of the *Dolorosa* is attained in the effecting of an internal rhyme:

Fac ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem.

The third line of the next stanza is given by Ozanam:

Stans inter tripudia.

Schaff appears to have read Ozanam's line:

Stans inter tripudio,

misled, apparently, by the thought of a rhyme for the *commercio* closing the stanza. He accordingly changes the line into

Stantem in tripudio,

and writes a footnote: "I suggest this as an emendation for the very obvious mistake of the original, as given by Ozanam." Dr. Coles accepts the suggested emendation, and also appends to the page a note: "Since *inter* never rules the ablative, Dr. Schaff proposes to read 'Stantem in tripudio!' referring 'Stantem' to 'me.'"

From all this it seems evident that the text has not been faithfully preserved, and that no very strong argument can be based on its lack of finish to prove that the author of the finished poem *Stabat Mater dolorosa* could scarce have been the author also of the *Stabat Mater speciosa.* Wherever it was possible to amend the text according to the suggested readings just given, we have done so in the comparison columns already included in this paper. But in offering the following translation of the *Speciosa*,[2] we have thought proper to confront it with the text of Ozanam, with the single exception that three lines found in Cardinal Wiseman's *Essay on Minor Rites*, etc., and not found in Ozanam, are included, but are placed in brackets.

[2] It has been translated by Neale, Coles, McCarthy and anonymously in the Roman Catholic *Parochial Hymn Book.*

THE TEXT OF OZANAM.

Stabat Mater speciosa,
Juxta foenum gaudiosa,
  Dum jacebat parvulus.
Cujus animam gaudentem,
Laetabundam ac ferventem,
  Pertransivit jubilus.

O quam laeta et beata
Fuit illa immaculata
  Mater unigeniti!
Quae gaudebat, et ridebat,
Exsultabat, cum videbat
  Nati partum inclyti.

Quis est qui non gauderet *(sic)*
Christi Matrem si videret
  In tanto solatio?
Quis non posset collaetari
Christi Matrem contemplari
  Ludentem cum Filio?

Pro peccatis suae gentis,
Christum vidit cum jumentis,
  Et algori subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Vagientem, adoratum
  Vili diversorio.

Nato Christo in praesepe,
Coeli cives canunt laete
  Cum immenso gaudio.
Stabat senex cum puella,
Non cum verbo nec loquela,
  Stupescentes cordibus.

Eia Mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim ardoris
  Fac ut tecum sentiam!
Fac ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum
  Ut sibi complaceam.

Sancta Mater, istud agas:
Prone *(sic)* introducas plagas
  Cordi fixas valide.

TRANSLATION.

Stood the fairest Mother, keeping
Watch and ward o'er Jesus sleeping
  On His couch of pillowing straw;
Yet with what delight unbounded
Was her glowing heart surrounded
  As her dearest Babe she saw!

Joy she felt, as might no other
Save alone the spotless Mother
  Of the Sole-begotten One:
How her swelling breast was telling
The indwelling joys upwelling
  As she bent above her Son!

Who can read the wondrous story,
Nor feel something of the glory
  Christ's dear Mother felt of old?
Who can picture her caressing
Such a Child, nor feel a blessing
  Like to hers, his heart enfold?

For His people's sins, a manger
Held the Saviour as a stranger,
  Chilled with worse than wintry air:
Yet the angels bowed before Him,
Magi hastened to adore Him;
  Stable 't was—yet Heaven was there.

Christ was born within a stable:
Sing, ye heavenly hosts, unable
  To contain your vast amaze:
Yet a deeper joy unspoken
Held the twain in peace unbroken—
  Mary, Joseph, silent gaze.

Mother, fount of love o'erflowing,
Let me share with thee the glowing
  Ardors of the cherubim;
That my inmost heart, revealing
Nought but love at Love's unsealing,
  May be pleasing unto Him.

Holy Mother, let me borrow
Something of thy tender sorrow,
  Graven deeply on my heart:

Tui Nati coelo lapsi,
Jam dignati foeno nasci
Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me vere congaudere,
Jesulino cohaerere,
Donec ego vixero.
(Juxta stramen tecum stare
Et me tecum sociare
In foeno desidero.)

In me sistat ardor tui,
Puerino fac me frui,
Dum sum in exilio.
Hunc ardorem fac communem,
Ne facias me immunem,
Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo Virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara:
Fac me parvum rapere.
Fac ut portem pulchrum fantem, *(sic)*
Qui nascendo vicit mortem,
Volens vitam tradere.

Fac me tecum satiari,
Nato tuo inebriari,
Stans inter tripudia.
Inflammatus et accensus,
Obstupescit omnis sensus
Tali de commercio.

Fac me nato custodiri,
Verbo Dei praemuniri,
Conservari gratia.
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animae donetur
Tui Nati visio.[3]

Omnes stabulum amantes,
Et pastores vigilantes
Pernoctantes sociant.
Per virtutem Nati tui,
Ora ut electi sui
Ad patriam veniant.
Amen.

[3] Ici doit finir la prose de Jacopone. Une main etrangère peut-être y ajouta les deux strophes suivantes.

Of the shame the manger offered,
Of the woes the Saviour suffered,
  Let me share with thee a part.

Grant a measure of thy pleasure;
Let me hold thy Baby Treasure
  Throughout life with love and awe:
Count me no intruding stranger
If with thee, beside His manger,
  I bend o'er the scattering straw.

While an exile here I wander,
May my longing soul grow fonder
  Of my Infant God and thee;
Closer be the constant union,
Dearer still the sweet communion
  With the Holy Family.

Virgin, purer than all others,
Mother, tenderest of mothers,
  To mine arms thy Infant give:
Let me bear the precious Burden,
Whose dear birth prepared our guerdon;
  For He died that we might live.

Let me taste the raptured sweetness
Of the Babe's divine completeness—
  Let me leap with joy divine:
Steep my senses beyond measure
In the ocean depths of pleasure,
  Since such fellowship is mine.

May the Word of God forearm me;
Through His love, no evil harm me,
  Saved and nourished by His grace:
When in death the veil is riven,
May my soul, caught up to Heaven,
  See Him ever face to face.

All who love the stable lowly,
With the shepherds joined, a holy
  Vigil keep of faith and love:
Mary, pray we may inherit
Through thy Son's atoning merit,
  Endless fatherland above.

H. T. Henry.

St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook.

THE JESUITS OF L'ANCIEN REGIME WHO LABORED ON MICHIGAN SOIL—THEIR DETRACTORS.

1. The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France; 1610-1791. The Original French, Italian, and Latin Texts; with English translations and notes; illustrated by portraits, maps and fac-similes. Edited by Reuben Gold Twaites, Secretary State Historical Society of Wisconsin; 1902. Cleveland, the Burrows Brothers. Octavo, 71 volumes, each about 300 pages.
2. Collections and Researches made by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society. Vol. xxix. Octavo pp. 764. Lansing, Mich., 1901.
3. History of the Catholic missions among the Indian tribes of the United States; 1529-1854; by John Gilmary Shea. 12mo., pp. 506. New York, E. Dunnigan and Brother, 1855.
4. Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., Missionary; by Rev. Joseph Stephen La Boule. Parkman Club publication No. 17. Milwaukee, Wis., 1897.
5. Father James Marquette, S. J. The missionary explorer. By Hon. Thomas A. E. Weadock, Member of Congress from Michigan. U. S. Catholic Historical Society Magazine. Vol. i., 1892.
6. Sketch of Father Louis André, S. J., by Father Arthur E. Jones, S. J., archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal, Canada. U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine, New York, 1889.

MICHIGAN includes two Peninsulas, known as the Lower and the Upper. The former extends downward from the conjunction of the waters of Lakes Michigan and Huron, known as the Straits of Mackinac, in which mingle those of the Georgian Bay, and the overflow of Lake Superior. Lake Huron receives these waters and discharges them into the River Saint Clair, thence into the lake of that name, which circling around the head of Belle Isle, reunite in the beautiful bay, whence for twenty miles extends *le détroit du Lac Erie;* which latter speeds them on their way to Niagara and the Atlantic.

It was at the head of this Strait that the city, taking its name from the deep and limpid stream, which courses downward, since known as Detroit, was founded in 1701.

When the Territory of Michigan, which comprised only the Lower Peninsula, was seeking statehood in 1836, she claimed that her southern boundary line included what is now the city of Toledo.

The State of Ohio disputed this claim, and her Governor, Lucas, prepared to sustain her pretension. But Michigan, too plucky to submit to the "Buckey" blusterer, called out her soldiers, which, "horse foot and artillery," were equipped, and under command of her young Governor, Stevens T. Mason, marched to the vicinity of the muddy little burg of Toledo. But President Andrew Jackson had at the time more important matters claiming his attention than the "Toledo war."

Ohio was given Toledo, and Michigan was placated by the gift of the entire Upper Peninsula, known at the time as the "Lake Superior Region," which, when Michigan was admitted to statehood, became part of her domain.

The Lower Peninsula, from her southern boundary line, is entirely surrounded with water. Through the centre of these waterways runs the line which separates the sovereignty of the American from the British.

The northern extremity of the Lower Peninsula is watered by the Straits of Mackinac, which contains the island of that name. It includes Cheboygan, Emmet and Presque Isle counties. Across the Straits is St. Ignace, which may be said to divide the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan. It is in the county of Michilimacinac where commences the territory of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Lake Superior is reached by the River St. Mary. The approach to this stream, through which flow the surplus waters of the greatest fresh water sea in the world, is through the most charming water region in North America.

It is doubtful if there exists any fresh water bay in America of such an extent as the Georgian Bay. Its atmosphere of freshness is temperate, while its waters are so transparent that at a depth of 30 feet the white pebbles on its bottom are one of its beautiful features; while the finny tribes, as each may be startled by the shadow, are clearly defined, and whose phosphorescent sheen, as they dart to and fro, startle the beholder from the steamer's deck, as this paradise of Michigan's water region is traversed. This is the approach to the chilly and sterile region of Lake Superior, comprising the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan. It has memories of historic interest connecting with the establishing of Christianity in this part of Michigan, 260 years ago.

In 1641 the Jesuit missionary fathers, Isaac Jogues and Charles Raymbaut, who had served in Huronia, zealous to propagate Christianity among the Indian nations of Northwestern Michigan as now constituted, crossed in their bark canoe the romantic Georgian Bay and ascended the stream flowing from the North into its waters and leading to Lake Superior, which they named in honor of the mother of our Saviour, St. Mary. The *Sault Ste. Marie*, "Leap of the St. Mary," as named by the Jesuits, Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, is a historic locality in American Catholic annals. The standard of the Cross was raised here and the Chippewas baptized by these Jesuit missionaries, before Eliot had begun to preach to the unfortunate Massachusetts tribes at Nonatum.

The river at the Sault is about a mile and a quarter wide, and the rapids or cataract, whose bottom is formed by huge boulders, over which the overflow of the waters of the great fresh water sea, Lake Superior, leap and rush madly down to the level below, roaring and foaming for three-quarters of a mile, through a breadth of over 1,000 feet, creating an atmosphere of freshness which can be compared

only to that of Niagara, where these same waters take their grandest leap on their way to the Atlantic.[1]

The scene is a wild one, while its natural features have changed but little, since the two missionary fathers gazed in wonder at the raging waters. But its surroundings at the present day are bewildering to the student of less than half a century ago. A system of lockage, the finest and most extensive in the world, with a double capacity, has been built by the American Government, under the supervision of General Orlando M. Poe, U. S. Topographical Engineers, on the American side, which permits the passage from the lower lakes into Lake Superior, and vice versa, of the largest freight steamers known in modern times, with cargoes of coal, etc., going up, and cargoes of flour, cereals, ore, metals, etc., going down. A similar system of lockage has been built on the Canadian side; while the most gigantic water power system known on the American continent is in progress. An international bridge spans the rapids over which extensive trains run constantly. The arrivals and clearances and aggregate annual tonnage exceed that of any commercial port in the world, while the value of the product carried is enormous.

But the Chippewas and other tribes have gradually disappeared, and with them the population of half-breeds of French and Indian stock. Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, hoping to return and evangelize the Chippewas, departed for Canada. The careers of both these holy missionaries were prematurely ended.[2]

After an interval of nearly twenty years the veteran of the Iroquoian missions, René Menard, opened the first regular mission on the soil of Michigan at Keweenaw Bay in 1660.

There is something sublime and grand, writes Dr. Shea, in the heroism of these early missionaries. Menard went destitute and alone, broken with age and toil. His head was whitened with years, his face scarred with wounds received in the streets of Cayuga, for he had been one of the first to bear the faith into Central New York. Thoroughly inured to Indian life, with a knowledge of many Huron and Algonquin dialects, René Menard sought to conclude his life's labors among the Ottawas of Michigan. His journey from Montreal with the fleet of returning Ottawa canoes to the waters of Lake Superior was a long drawn *Via Crucis*, while its narration is painful to read. The brutal Ottawa chiefs, who made the venerable man of

[1] "The Chippewas of Lake Superior," by R. R. Elliott, AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. xxi., No. 82. April, 1896.

[2] Father Jogues was a native of Orleans, France; born in January, 1607. His family was respectable and still exists in his native city. He became a Jesuit in 1636, proceeded to Quebec, thence to Huronia. His missionary career abounds in atrocious cruelty and ends in death from an Iroquoian tomahawk, 1646. Father Raymbaut succumbed to climatic fever.

God toil without food or rest, paid no regard to his silvered head or to his wasted frame.

But he finally reached Keweenau, which was his "first station" in missionary work on Michigan soil; where, like his brethren in other fields of apostolic work, he sought out, reaffirmed in the faith, encouraged and consoled such Christian families as were domiciled in the Keweenaw district. His own account of his apostolate is discouraging and sad to read. But where this venerable soldier of the cross rendered up his soul to God, whether he died by violence or by starvation, is one of the unsolved problems in the missionary history of Michigan.

Succeeding Father René Menard was the venerable Father Gabriel Druillettes, who labored at or near Sault Ste. Marie till 1699, when he returned to Quebec and died there in April, 1681, at the age of 88. He was, quotes Dr. Shea, a man of 50 when he came; he suffered more than most of his companions, while his extreme zeal for the conversion of souls and the great talent God had given him for languages made him one of our best missionaries.

Charlevoix, after relating one of the miracles ascribed to him, says that God had rendered him powerful in word and work.[3]

Another celebrated Jesuit missionary who labored on Michigan soil was Father Claude Dablon, who had accompanied Father Druillettes on an expedition overland to Hudson's Bay, who was next with Father Marquette on Lake Superior in 1668, and who after founding the mission of Sault Ste. Marie, became superior of all the missions in 1670.

In chronological order we now take up one of the most illustrious of the fathers of the Society of Jesus, of *l'ancien régime*, who labored on the soil of Michigan, James Marquette. In the sketch of the life of this distinguished missionary by Hon. Thomas Addis Emmet Weadock, M. C. from Michigan, which was read before the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York, and which has been printed in the annals of this society, he writes:

His story is particularly interesting to the people of Michigan because: He established the first permanent settlement begun by Europeans in this state, Sault Ste. Marie, in 1668. He was the first white man that trod the soil of the Island of Mackinac or the territory which is now known as the State of Iowa.

He erected the first cabin and said the first Mass in Chicago, and said the first Mass in what is now the State of Illinois. He discovered the tidal rise and fall in Lake Michigan 150 years before it was noticed by another, and last, and greatest of all in a historical sense,

---

[3] Shea's "French Missions," p. 141.

he discovered the Father of Waters, the Mississippi. The city of Laon, capital of Picardy, was the birthplace of James Marquette, in the year 1637. His family was among the first of the *bourgeois* class in his native city; while in the century succeeding, three of his name and kindred fought and bled for American Independence, under Lafayette.

His mother, who was a La Salle, inculcated in his youthful mind that deep reverence for the Mother of God, which was always a feature in his religious life. At the age of 17 he joined the Society of Jesus; after the usual fourteen years' probation he was ordained to the priesthood. In 1666 he sailed for Canada and arrived at Quebec September 20 of the same year.

His vocation was that of a missionary, awaiting the order of the superior of the Jesuits at Quebec. He was in the prime of life, 31 years old.

After two years' study of the Indian dialects at the College of Quebec he was directed to prepare for the Ottawa mission in the far distant west. He had acquired a fair knowledge of the dialects of the Upper Lake Indian tribes.

Father Marquette was sent to Sault Ste. Marie, where in 1668 he founded the first permanent European settlement in Michigan, which was located where the city of that name now stands. In the following year he was joined by Father Claude Dablon, S. J. There were, it is stated, about 2,000 Indians of the Algonquin tribes in the vicinity, but this number may have been an exaggerated estimate.

They were well disposed towards Christianity, but the missionaries used extreme caution in administering the Sacrament of Baptism. The chapel erected was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, as the rapids and the river had been given the name of the Mother of God by their brethren, Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, the former of whom had, as stated, met a martyr's death at the hands of the Mohawks, while the latter had been called to his eternal reward.

From Sault Ste. Marie Father Marquette was transferred to Chegoimegon, subsequently known as La Pointe du St. Esprit, which he reached after a month's journey, attended by dangers and hardships. He arrived in 1669. War was provoked two years later between the Hurons and the Ottawas, and the powerful and warlike nation of the Sioux. As a result, the two former nations, accompanied by Father Marquette, were forced to leave Chegoimegon.

A settlement was made at Point St. Ignace, where a chapel was built. This locality was on the coast at a point subsequently known as Michilimacinac and was the centre of Catholic Indian missionary work as long as New France was under French control. It must not be confounded with the Island of Mackinac, peopled by some of the Ottawas, which, after the British conquest, was fortified and

garrisoned. But St. Ignace, which as Father Marquette writes was the central point between the three great lakes, was a bleak and cold locality. In winter the cold was intense, while the winds, now from Lake Huron, then from Lake Michigan, and worse than all, from Lake Superior, made the climate at times intensely cold. The cultivation of the soil was attended with poor results. But the finest fresh water fish in the world abounded, while at certain seasons of the year game was available.

In 1672 Father Marquette reported to the Father Superior at Quebec the prosperous state of his mission and expressed his readiness to leave and seek unknown nations to the South. The assurance was brought him that he was to go as a missionary to explore the Mississippi. Joliet, the royal hydrographer, was sent by the Intendant Talon as a scientific companion of the missionary. He arrived at St. Ignace on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, auspiciously, too, because Father Marquette had invoked her aid to obtain from God the favor of being able to visit the nations on the Mississippi.

Preparations for the voyage were completed during the winter. Toward the latter part of May, 1673, Father Marquette and M. Joliet, with two bark canoes, five Indians and a supply of provisions, left St. Ignace, and began their journey, according to their plans, which had been outlined and mapped, to discover and explore the great river of the South the missionary had set his heart upon reaching.

It does not fall within the purpose of this study to detail missionary work outside the boundaries of Michigan. The history of the discovery and exploration of the Mississippi, by Father Marquette, has been faithfully related by the accomplished and painstaking Mr. Weadock. For all that he has proposed he quotes acknowledged historical gospel.

We shall therefore attempt to outline the melancholy ending of the career of Father Marquette, which occurred on Michigan soil after his return from his Mississippi voyage. He wished to die at Michilimacinac among his brethren with the rites of the Holy Church, so he set out on his return voyage via St. Joseph's river and the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. His strength gradually failed, but he calmly contemplated the end with Christian fervency.

It was given to Father Marquette to die on Michigan soil. It imports but little under what circumstances, or precisely where his young life was ended. His mortal remains were in time discovered by Father Gabriel Richard of Detroit, and the place marked. But these particulars, comparatively speaking, are of small import; the glorious renown of the missionary is a part of American history. Here in Detroit, a statue of the missionary and explorer adorns the

façade of the City Hall, placed there by one of the purest minded gentlemen who had not had the blessing of living in the Catholic faith, but who was attracted by that magic which binds men of genius to each other, regardless of race or creed, to pay this tribute to Marquette.[4]

So, also, another statue, by a celebrated artist, has been placed in the Capitol at Washington. It commemorates the memory of a priest, missionary and explorer, which the people of the States of the giant West decided to have placed there, but which the small souled pygmies whose narrow minds reject the freedom of religion, opposed under one pretext or another, until it happily fell to Mr. Weadock, to whose memoir we have been so much indebted for what we have written of Marquette, to have the wishes of the people of the West gratified. There is another monument to the young missionary and explorer, quite significantly placed, in a locality equally suggestive; this is in the city of Marquette, queen city of the Lake Superior region of Michigan, where by the efforts of a noble hearted gentleman, Peter White, whom, much to our regret, we admit, is not of our own faith, a replica of Trentanova's statue at the Capitol at Washington has been erected in that city on the shores of Lake Superior, which perpetuates his name among the people of the State, where his young life was ended.

In 1676 Father Peter A. Bonneault and Henry A. Nouvel, S. J., labored at Sault Ste. Marie, while Father Philip Pierson, S. J., had succeeded Father Marquette in the care of the Christian Hurons at Michilimacinac.

Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., "The Apostle of the Ottawas and the builder of the first Indian missions in Wisconsin," as his most recent biographer, Rev. Joseph Stephen La Boule, Professor in the Provincial Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, Milwaukee, designates him, was among the early Jesuit missionary Fathers who traversed the soil of Michigan.

His labors, however, were more identified with the neighboring State of Wisconsin, but more particularly with that portion whose soil is bordered by the waters of Lake Superior. Father La Boule writes:

"I deem it a pleasure and a duty to my native State to survey the life of this remarkable man, and to trace, even though it be with unskilled eye, 'the footprints he has left behind him in the sands of time.' "[5]

Father Allouez was born in St. Didier near Lyons, apparently in June, 1622. His collegiate course is described by his biographer

[4] The late Bela Hubbard.
[5] Parkman Club Publications, No. 17. Milwaukee, Wis., June 8, 1897.

and his successful examination at Puy, after which he prepared himself to become a priest, a Jesuit and a missionary.

At the age of 17 he was received a member of the Society of Jesus and after the usual probationary term of fourteen years he was ordained to the priesthood and assigned to duty in the Jesuit church of Rhodez, France. But his soul moved him to a more heroic career, and he sought to develop it in missionary work in New France. Father Rocette, S. J., his superior at Toulouse, wrote him March 3, 1657, with permission to go to Canada and to join his brother Jesuits engaged in missionary work among the Indians. His qualities are thus noted: "He is possessed of a vigorous constitution, of a fine mind and disposition, of good judgment and great prudence. He is firm in purpose, proficient in literature and theology and eminently fitted for missionary work."[6]

Here, then, writes his biographer, is a Frenchman of the mountainous Loire country type; a man of middle stature, of vigorous frame, yet graceful deportment; a man who is inured to exposure and toil, as he is trained in the science of spiritual perfection; capable of living contented in the huts of barbarians as well as moving with due tact in salons of refined French society.

Such a man it is whom we presently see embarking on a project which, as Bancroft says, "has imperishably connected his name with the progress of discovery in the West," and which made him the apostle of the Upper Lake Indians.[7]

Father Allouez was invited to sail with M. D'Argenson, who had recently been appointed Governor of New France. Two lay brothers joined the party, and after a long and stormy voyage Quebec was reached July 11, 1658. He soon after commenced a preparatory course of the study of the Upper Lake Indian dialects. While awaiting at the College of Quebec a favorable opportunity to reach the Ottawa mission, intelligence was received of the death of two distinguished Indian missionaries; first of Father Leonard Garreau, who met a terrible fate; second of Father Menard, his dear friend, to whom he had bade farewell on his departure from Three Rivers for the Lake Superior country in 1660.

In May, 1665, Father Allouez left the college to meet the Ottawa Indians who annually came from the Upper Lakes to trade at Three Rivers. He was disappointed; he found them uncouth and brutal "beyond description." But this was not the worst, they were unfriendly.

It was not without difficulty that he obtained an equivocal per-

[6] Father La Boule quotes from the Jesuit archives of France, and also *in re*, Dr. Shea's opinion.

[7] Parkman Club Publications, No. 17, p. 185.

mission for himself and party, six in all, to accompany the Ottawas on their return journey to Michilimacinac, and then they were separated among 400 Indians. The route taken at that time for such parties was up the Ottawa River and by way of Lake Nipissing with portages to the Georgian Bay, and thence to Lake Huron. It was a journey of 500 or 600 miles from Three Rivers, with many portages, across which had to be carried the canoes and effects of the travelers. It is difficult to describe the cruel treatment experienced at the hands of these brutal Indians during this long and tedious journey lasting over two months, by this devoted missionary; starvation, overwork, and finally abandonment after his canoe had been disabled, on a desolate shore. But Father Allouez had great faith in the Divine mercy; he survived the ordeal and won the admiration of the Ottawa chiefs.

The flotilla finally arrived at Sault Ste. Marie, but did not tarry there, although the missionary would have been much gratified to have visited with the few Frenchmen then domiciled at the *Sault.*

The fleet of canoes were carried over the portage and launched into the waters of the great lake, coasting along the south shore.

It was great enjoyment for Father Allouez during all the rest of that month to witness the ever changing and wild scenery of the coast of Lake Superior.

He rested at Keweenaw Bay where Menard had preached to the Ottawa Indians. Here were found two Christian Huron women, whom he says shone like brilliant stars in this darkness of paganism. No doubt, adds his biographer, he also said Mass at this spot consecrated by his saintly brother missionary.

On he went, still westward. He was now on what was to white men territory comparatively unexplored. His tone of correspondence becomes that of a keen observer.

Game and fish are more abundant, and the quality, he tells us, is excellent. His attention is called to the presence of copper mines by the color of the water and the frequent discovery of copper in pieces of ten and twenty pounds on the shores.

The Indians, continues his biographer, seemed to have improved their treatment of Father Allouez, which was now much better. A box in which he had put a number of devotional and other articles and which his Indian companions had stolen from him, was now restored to him.

Henceforth the missionary and his effects were regarded as "manitous," dangerous to touch. His mind became more cheerful and he continues to describe the scenes about him on "the lake that is so stormy and yet so beautiful and so rich in delicious fish and shining metal," that he did not wonder the Indians worshiped it as a divinity and offered it sacrifice.

The Indian fleet had now traversed a distance which Father La Boule estimated at 1,250 miles from Three Rivers, in their bark canoes, and were approaching their destination. They were greatly elated when in the distance they perceived a tongue of land jutting out into the stormy bay at the southwestern end of the lake.

It was the sandspit so familiar to the Lake Superior Indians famed in their early myths and later history as Chequamegon Point.

Father Allouez, continues his biographer, landed with the flotilla at the head of Chequamegon Bay October 1, 1665.

Subsequently he located his mission, which he dedicated to the Holy Ghost, contiguous to the villages of the Huron and of the Ottawa nations; the location, in modern days, without wasting time in tracing its exact locality, may be said to be tributary to what is familiarly known as La Pointe, in the head waters of Lake Superior, or as described in the early annals Fond du Lac.

A chapel of bark and a "mission house" of the same material, of modest proportions, were soon constructed for Father Allouez.

Then, after fervent appeals for heavenly assistance, he commenced his apostolic work. Like his saintly brethren in the cantons of the Iroquoian Confederacy, at a corresponding period, he found among the expatriated Hurons many Christian families, whose faith he revived; whose marriages he validated; and whose children he baptized. This experience was vouchsafed to the holy missionary, in consolation for the drastic and crucial incidents of the journey of over 1,200 miles, in which he had been made to endure more than an ordinary white man's share, between Three Rivers and the head waters of Lake Superior. Soon, his biographer states, he taught the playful, tawny little girls and the future Indian braves to raise their hands to Heaven and to chant in melancholy but sweet tones the Pater and the Ave.

From morning dawn to sunset the braves and the squaws, in great number, came to visit the "black robe" to be taught by him how to pray to the "Great Father." The example of the children soon had its effect upon the older Indians.

The laxity of morals so common even among the children was now relieved by most edifying examples of purity; one of which Father Allouez mentions in his *relations*.

Similar evidence of remarkable virtue in this connection is given in the diary of the missionary and are on record.

Besides the little children baptized on New Year's day, 1666, whom the mothers brought to the missionary as "a gift to the little Jesus," he baptized more than 400 infants and adults of the Huron tribes, during his stay at the Bay.

The Hurons were among the elite of the Indian nations of North

America. They had been foremost during the seventeenth century in accepting Christianity. But their nation had been wiped out of existence in Huronia, by their hereditary foes, the warriors of the Iroquoian Confederacy; while their national autonomy for the time being was destroyed.

Many prisoners, men, women and children, had been brought from Huronia to the Iroquoian cantons, where mothers mourned for sons, the flower of the youth of the Five Nations.

The captives were adopted into the communities of the respective tribes. This new blood was much needed in the desolate families of the Iroquoian mothers.

But this new blood was Christian, and thus was Christianity planted in the nations of the League, from the Mohawk to the shores of Lake Erie. We have here related, another example of the tenacity of the faith planted in the hearts of the people of Huronia by the martyred brethren of Father Allouez.

But this was mild work for this zealous apostle. Contiguous to the locality of the Hurons was the Pagan Ottawa canton, whose people Father Allouez determined to convert. He erected a birch bark chapel and mission house in the midst of their cabins. It was a bold, a heroic enterprise, inspired by confidence in the support of the Almighty Power.

His biographer preludes his experience by saying that the status of affairs found in the Ottawa village must have brought to his mind a picture of pandemonium. This he must have expected. But, in the description of no other Indian village, does Father Allouez employ terms so expressive of abhorrence as he does in describing the moral condition of the Ottawas at Chequamegon Bay. The people recognized no sovereign master of Heaven and Earth; they worshiped the sun, the moon, the lakes and rivers, wild beasts, the elements, and demons.

Father Allouez calls their canton a Babylon of libertinism and abomination.

These people, the missionary states, are very little disposed to receive the faith; because they are, more than all others addicted to idolatry, polygamy, laxity of the marriage tie, and to general licentiousness which makes them cast aside all natural decorum. These were the first impressions conceived by the pure soul of Father Allouez. His later experience was more hopeful. Of the Pottawatamies, the Outagamies and the Illinois tribes who came during the fishing season, he speaks more favorably:

Great quantities of whitefish, trout and herring are caught here. The season begins in November and continues after the ice has been formed. Speaking of thte Pottawatamies, Father Allouez says

"they are the most docile to our Frenchmen and promising candidates for Christianity, their women are more modest than those of other Indian nations, while the men are kindly mannered.

Father Allouez failed to make any progress among the Ottawas. Convinced that one missionary would be inadequate to combat so much opposition to Christianity he turned his face homeward. But before commencing his return journey, he courageously started for Lake Nepigon. This involved a journey going and coming of more than 1,200 miles. But this great labor was well rewarded. He was received by the Nipissings with open arms. He revived their faith and restored the religious status of their family life.

He remarks: "The fervent devotion of this people gave me sweet consolation and compensated abundantly for past hardships."

The field, writes his biographer, had become too great for one missionary. Help was needed. In 1667 Father Allouez returned to Quebec, where he arrived during the first days of August. The purpose of his visit was to urge the establishment of permanent missions at Chequamegon and tributary territory; to get assistance and requisites for mission chapels. He would take no rest after his long journey and in a few days was ready to return with the Indian flotilla.

Father Louis Nicolas, S. J., and one *donné* volunteered to return with him, as also several French mechanics.

But the Indians refused to take the latter, with the missionary party. All the equipments for his chapels had to be left behind. Father Allouez returned to the scene of his missionary labors, where his biographer states he remained some years. Father Louis Nicolas, S. J., is described in the Relations as "a strong, practical, 'every-day' man and a tireless worker."

His progress was unsatisfactory and he became despondent. One day, it is stated, he told the Ottawas he was going to Sault Ste. Marie. They would not consent to this, admitted their past indifference and promised to amend their lives, and in fact made a serious effort to abolish polygamy, idolatry and superstition. In time many became fervent Christians.

Father Allouez returned to Sault Ste. Marie in 1669, and Father James Marquette took his place at Chequamegon Bay.

Dr. Shea says: Father Allouez was a fearless and devoted missionary; as a man of zeal and piety he is not inferior to any of his day; and his name is imperishably connected with the progress of discovery in the West.[8]

This is a very high tribute; for the days of Father Allouez were those of scholarly and scientific men; numbering saints, martyrs,

[8] History of the Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the United States, etc., by Dr. John Gilmary Shea. P. 413.

explorers and heroes; such indeed were his contemporaries, his brethren of *l'ancien régime* of the Society of Jesus in North America. After thirteen years more of missionary work in Western fields the heroic career of this saintly man was ended.

Associated with him at times on Michigan soil was Father Louis André, S. J., of whom Father Arthur Jones, S. J., of St. Mary's College, Montreal, writes:

Father Louis André was born in 1623, and previous to his coming to New France he had entered the Society of Jesus as a member of the Province of Toulouse. As a Canadian missionary he was within the jurisdiction of the province of France. Father André reached Quebec on the 7th of June, 1669.

But a short time elapsed before he was sent to the Western Missions, where Claude Allouez, James Marquette, Claude Dablon, together with the coadjutor Brother Louis Le Boesme, were already toiling in the Master's vineyard. André's year of apprenticeship to a missionary life was made probably in part at St. Ignace, Michilimacinac and at the Baie des Puants.

The winter was probably passed at the former. Fathers André and Druillettes were at Sault Ste. Marie in the spring of 1670. To enable the reader, writes Father Jones, to form an adequate idea of the hardships endured by Father André, and to obtain a graphic account of his apostolic labors, the Jesuit Relations themselves should be consulted, as therein the facts are given, often in his own words.

In 1671 Father André was again at Michilimacinac; from this year until 1681 he worked during all seasons for the conversion of the Western nations. In 1682 he rested from his continuous labors at Michilimacinac, but only for a year. The following year he was again on his missionary tours.

He was a successful missionary wherever he worked. This was his last year's work in the Western Missions. He was now in his sixtieth year. The Father Superior at Quebec deemed advisable to give him a permanent rest and he was accordingly recalled to Quebec. He was named professor of philosophy in the Jesuits' College, and performed other literary work until 1690; in the meantime he had compiled his Algonquin and Ottawa dictionary, and had written other philological treatises. But this literary work did not satisfy the nature or the ambition of Father André. He was a passionate hunter for human souls.

No sportsman in the pursuit of the wild game of the forest was so ardent as he was to convert from Paganism an Indian and to regenerate his soul with the Sacraments of the Church. He laid aside his literary labors and with the crucifix in hand labored among

the Indian tribes in what is now the Province of Quebec, and with great success.

It was not, however, until 1715 that he was called to his eternal reward at the age of 92. The following circular, continues Father Jones, was sent by his superior, as was the custom on these occasions, to the other houses of the Order. It is the first time it is published:

Quebec, 1 November, 1715.

Reverend Father, Pax Christi:

We have recently lost, in the person of Father Louis André, a missionary laborer loaded down even more with the weight of merit than of years. It is now over forty-five years since he devoted himself to the conversion of the Indians, and it may be justly said of him that in so painful and laborious a vocation he accomplished all the duties of an excellent missionary. There is no doubt but that it was with natural repugnance he adopted the Indian mode of life, and that he underwent many hardships in the long and weary journeyings in which he accompanied his Indians.

These ever disheartened him, for he reckoned fatigue as nought when there was a question of God's glory or the salvation of souls. He labored on the mission until he had attained nearly his eightieth year, and if at any moment of his life he was called upon to do violence to himself in the practice of obedience, it was when his superiors, moved at the sight of his many infirmities and the sufferings inseparable from missionary labor, he must needs have endured at so advanced an age, put a stop to his departure and retained him at Quebec. . . . Already from far back in life, he had prepared himself for death.

It was on the 19th of September last, well on to 4 in the morning, that he went, as we have every reason to believe, fortified by the sacraments of the Church, to receive his eternal reward. You will accord him, Reverend Father, the usual suffrages of the Society, and for myself I beg a share in your Holy Sacrifices, in union with which I am with profound respect, Reverend Father, your Reverence's most humble and obedient servant,

JOSEPH GERMAIN, S. J.

Note by Father Jones. Translated from the copy of the original manuscripts preserved in the Archives of the "Gesu" at Rome.

The learned biographer concludes his memoirs as follows:

The name of Father André, though he had toiled so long in evangelizing the Indians, is not one familiar even to the admirers of the early Jesuit missionaries. If these disjointed notes succeed in drawing the attention of the student of our early history to so meritorious a career, it will amply repay the trouble and research required to bring them together, meagre though they be.

They will at least serve as pointers to his future biographers, who will find in the correct references to the early Relations, given, an easy means of filling out ish pages with a thousand interesting details I have omitted, but which are on record as illustrations of the life of this remarkable missionary of the West.[9]

St. Mary's College, Montreal, 27th April, 1889.

Father Philip Pierson succeeded Father Marquette in the control of the two missions at Michilimacinac, where he is credited with building a new chapel in 1674.

Other missionaries laboring at the same locality were in succession: Fathers Charles Albanel and Claude Aveneau.

A few years later we find the names of Fathers Bailloquet and Nouvel. These were subsequently succeeded by Fathers James J. Marest, and the veteran Iroquoian Missionary, Father Stephen de Carheil, who at the close of the seventeenth century were in charge of the missions at Michilimacinac.

[9] Sketch of Father Louis André, S. J. By Rev. A. E. Jones, S. J. U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine, No. 9.

This locality during the last decade of this same century had become a trading post of such importance that the government of New France maintained a small garrison under charge of a commandant and it was dignified with the name of post.

Its locality was such that trading expeditions on the way to or from Montreal, Three Rivers or Quebec, going or coming by the route via the Ottawa River, etc., tarried at Michilimacinac. The Ottawas domiciled in the vicinity, particularly on the island of Mackinac, were successful hunters; they usually returned from their periodical expeditions to their hunting fields with valuable packs of furs, which, annually, earlier in the century, they had carried for sale and barter to Three Rivers; their flotillas of bark canoes were of considerable extent, the Indians numbering occasionally as many as 400.

Gradually, however, the number of French traders annually coming to Michilimacinac had increased to such an extent that the Indians found it no longer necessary to make the long and toilsome journey to the St. Lawrence; they found a home market at Michilimacinac; this was before the garrisons and Commandants were sent to this locality. Before the advent of the latter the missionaries controlled the Indians and had maintained stringent rules excluding the traffic *eau de vie* among the Ottawas, Moreover, Christianity had been fairly well established, while morality and sobriety prevailed. There was peace and happiness in the Indian cabins. When, however, the commandants and soldiers came to the post from Canada, a great change succeeded; both officers and men became traders. Heretofore Michilimacinac had been the locality of missionary centres, over whose people the missionary fathers exercised a paternal control. Outside of the Indian population the commandants had properly controlled the soldiers and employees of the post.

But the Commandant, his officers, his soldiers and his employees had become traders with the Indians; the principal article of their traffic was *eau de vie,* dealt in at first, *sub rosa,* but later on openly and in *cabarets.*

The protests of the missionaries were without result; for Governor General Frontenac's ear was closed to any Jesuit's appeal.

Finally the Jesuits appealed to the Court of France, and with success. The traffic in *eau de vie* at Michilmacinac was suppressed.

But the mischief it had wrought to the bodies and souls of the Indians of the respective missions may be estimated in part only by the following letter from Father Stephen de Carheil, himself of noble blood, a veteran of the Iroquoian missions, and one of the holiest of the Jesuit priests who had devoted their lives to the conversion to

Christianity of the Indians of North America. At the time this letter was written Father de Carheil was superior of the missions centering at Michilimacinac, it was an exposé of affairs which was addressed to de Calliéres, Governor General of New France:

At Michilimacinac, the 30th August, 1902.

Monseigneur: Could I have believed that my going down below would have been of any greater use to you than have been all the letters that I have written to you continually, during fifteen entire years—for the purpose of informing you exactly, as in God's sight, according to truth, according to my conscience, of all that was absolutely necessary for the advancement of our missions and for the welfare of the Colony—I would not have failed to go down; and I would have made it my duty to go to explain to you verbally what I might not have sufficiently made known in my letters.

But as I have omitted nothing that I considered myself obliged to let you know, and as I do not see what could have been added to so many letters, I am fully convinced, that my going down could only have been useless to you, after all the information that has been conveyed to you respecting the condition in which we have been up to the present, and in which we still are to-day.

But even if I had never written to you, it was only necessary to have seen all that is to be seen every day at Montreal, and that you yourself have only too often seen, to enable you to carry back to France enough to give information to his majesty, and to constrain him to succor our missions. These are reduced to such an extremity that we can no longer maintain them against an infinite multitude of evil acts—acts of brutality and violence; of injustice and impiety; of lewd and shameless conduct; of contempt and insults. To such acts the infamous and baleful trade in *eau de vie* gives rise everywhere among all the nations up here—where it is carried on by going from village to village, and by roving over the lakes with a prodigious quantity of *eau de vie* in casks without any restraint. Had his majesty but once seen what passes here while this wretched traffic goes on, I am sure he would not for a moment hesitate at the very first sight of it, to forbid it forever under the severest penalties.

In our despair there is no other step to take than to leave our missions and abandon them to the traders in *eau de vie*, so they may establish therein the domain of their traffic, of drunkenness and of immorality.

That is what we shall propose to our superiors in Canada and in France, being compelled thereto by the state of uselessness and inability to which we have been reduced by the permission given to carry on that deplorable traffic—a permission that has been obtained from his majesty only by means of a pretext apparently reasonable, but known to be false; a permission that he would not grant if they whom he relies for ascertaining the truth really made it known to him as they themselves, and the whole of Canada with them, know it; a permission, in fine, that is at once the climax and the source of all the evils that are now occurring.

Especially does it cause the wrecks, of which we never heard before it was given, but which we now hear of as occurring almost every year—while the ships are either coming from or returning to France.

This results from a just punishment by God, who causes the destruction by water of what had been wickedly gained by *eau de vie*; and these wrecks should have prevented its transportation in order to avoid the evil use that would be made of it.

If that permission be not revoked by a prohibition to the contrary, we no longer have occasion to remain in any of our missions in this upper region, to waste the remainder of our lives and all our efforts in purely useless labor, under the dominion of continual drunkenness and of universal immorality—which are no less permitted to the traders in *eau de vie* than is the trade itself, of which they are both the accompaniment of the sequel.

If his majesty desires to save our missions and to support the establishment of religion, as we have no doubt he does, we beg him most humbly to believe what is true, namely: there is no other means of doing so than to abolish completely the two infamous sorts of commerce which have brought the missions to the brink of destruction, and which will not long delay in destroying these if they be not abolished as soon as possible by his orders, and being prevented from ever being restored. The first is the traffic in *eau de vie;* the second is the debauchment of the Indian women by the French. Both are carried on in an equally public manner, to the disgrace of the French name, without our being able to remedy the evil, because we missionaries are not supported by the commandants of this post. They, far from attempting, when we venture to remonstrate with them against the continuance of these evils, to restrain their excesses, themselves carry them on with greater freedom than do their subordinates; and so sanction them by their example, that, on witnessing it, a general permission and an assurance of impunity

are assured, that cause them to become so to all the French who come here to trade. So much is this the case that all the villages of our Indians have become drinking centres as regards drunkenness, and Sodoms as regards immorality—from which we missionaries must withdraw, and abandon to the just wrath and vengeance of God.

You will see by this that, in whatever manner French traffic is established among our Indians in these missions, if it be desired to retain us among them, and to support us in their villages in the capacity of missionaries, in the free exercise of our sacred functions, with the hope of obtaining salutary results, we must be delivered from the control of the commandants, and the pernicious influence of their garrisons. The latter, far from being necessary, are the most immoral element which mitigate against the work of our missionaries; for they serve by the demoralization they cause, to injure both the ordinary trade of the voyageur as well as religious observance. Since the military element has been established here, although it is by no means extensive, it has been a potent as well as a scandalous factor in the demoralization of the women of the Indian tribes living on the soil.

All the pretended service which the commandants profess to render to the king is reduced to four chief occupations, of which we earnestly beg you to inform his Majesty. The first consists in the traffic in *eau de vie* to the Indians, in their respective villages; who thereby drink to excess, to the ruin of their bodies and souls, and consequent misery in their respective families, notwithstanding all our efforts to prevent the evil, or to mitigate its destructive consequences. For this we are accused of opposing the King's service by opposing a traffic that he has permitted.

The second is, the selling of *eau de vie* and Indian goods to the soldiers of the garrison, and allowing them to go to the respective villages, where, in fact, they become the factors of the commandants who take no account of their misconduct and wink at their excesses.

The third occupation, consists in making of the fort, a place that I am ashamed to call by its proper name, where the Indian women have found out that their bodies might serve in lieu of beaver skins—and more acceptable than the latter; which demoralizing commerce is continual and extensive.

Whatever efforts the missionaries may make to denounce and abolish it, it continually increases. Besides, the soldiers living outside the forts keep open house, where Indian women pass entire days and nights.

The fourth occupation of the soldiers is gambling. During the season when the Indian traders assemble at the post, this evil becomes excessive. It takes the shape of a continual round of excessive drinking, of gaming and of quarreling. These scandalous excesses have a demoralizing effect upon the Indian population, who are scandalized, but who see that the missionaries are powerless to prevent or to remedy the evil.

Such, your Excellency, are the four principal occupations of the commandants and their garrisons, which have been notorious during many years. If occupations of this kind can be called the King's service. But I have observed none other.

There is no necessity for keeping garrisons here and after they are recalled there is really no necessity for sending others in their place. However, as the pretended need of garrisons is the sole pretext why they continue to be maintained here, we beg your Excellency to be fully convinced of the falsity of this pretense; for in reality the commandants come here mostly for the purpose of trading which becomes their principal occupation. They hold no intercourse with the missionaries, except in regard to matters which may be to their personal advantage; besides, they are hostile to the Fathers for the opposition of the latter to misconduct, which is not in accord with the service of God, and which is derogatory to the service of the King, although resulting to the advantage of the personal interests of the commandants, to which every consideration is sacrificed. This is the principal cause of the desolation of our missions through the ascendancy the commandants have obtained over the missionaries, by assuming all authority over both the French and the Indians—that we have no other power than to labor in vain under their domination, which has gone so far as to make civil crimes and grounds for juridical accusations out of the performance of the very functions of our ministry and of our duty. This was always done by M. de la Mothe Cadillac, who would not even allow us to use the word *desordres*, and who even brought a suit against the Father superior of the missions for having used it.[10] Before

[10] Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac; who was appointed commandant at Michilmacinac by Frontenac, of whom he was a favorite, in 1694. Before proceeding to his post, he borrowed 3,750 livres, which formed part of the money he invested in *eau de vie*, etc., for trading ventures. "A Sketch of the Life of Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac," by C. M. Burton. Detroit, 1895.

there were any commandants at this mission, the missionaries were respected and listened to by the traders; but since the commandants have been established here, the regime has changed.

The missionaries are no longer respected, they are reduced to silence, to inaction, to impotency, and to general deprivation of authority.

The commandants induced the government to place at their disposition funds for the purchase of presents and other benefits for the Indians.

This was unnecessary. The Indians needed no such stimulus.

The indiscreet methods of the disposition of this fund has excited the cupidity of the Indians, and has removed the sincerity of their natural instincts.

They have unfortunately swallowed the bait, and have become astute schemers for the spoil. But the gifts on this account have been reduced almost entirely to the single expenditure of tobacco. The residue, which is considerable, has become the perquisite of the commandants.

To all that I have said respecting the commandants, I must add—that, as there is no necessity of sending any among the Indians than that of keeping garrisons here, which must be commanded by some one—it is perfectly useless to send any; because the garrisons are quite unnecessary except for the traffic of the commandants and they are of no use either to the Indians or to the voyageurs, to whom the traffic belongs, or to the missionaries.

Your Excellency will see that I have dwelt to a great extent on the subject of commandants and garrisons, to make you understand that all the misfortunes of our missions are due to them.

It is the Commandants, it is the garrisons, who, uniting with the traffickers in *eau de vie*, have completely desolated the missions by the almost universal drunkenness and lewdness, which prevails.

The civil authorities tolerate these evils, although able to prevent them—they do not.

I have therefore no hesitation in saying to your Excellency, that if this state of things continue, we shall be compelled to abandon our missions, because we shall be unable to work for the salvation of souls.

It is for you to inform his Majesty of the extremity to which we are reduced, and to ask him for our deliverance in order that we may labor for the spread of religion without the hindrances that have hitherto impeded our work.

As regards the Detroit establishment, I have nothing to tell you about it of my own knowledge; I have no information concerning it, except through the reports of the Frenchmen and of the Indians who talk with us here about it.

Judging from their reports, it does not seem to them to be an advantageous establishment. They are not satisfied with it, for various very important reasons—which I have pointed out to the Rev. Father Superior in what I wrote for my justification against the charges brought by M. de La Mothe Cadillac, who continues to persecute me.

I would not now be in my present dilemma, had I deserved to have been accorded the favor I solicited at your hands, that of sending to the Court of France the letter containing our complaints in thirteen articles to be presented to his Majesty, begging him to do us justice against the calumnies and violence of M. de La Mothe Cadillac, and to protect us against his threats of ruining our missions, which he was then publicly uttering in the presence of the French, who listened to him with astonishment.[11] I foresaw very well that he was a man capable of carrying his evil designs before the Court of France, as he has already done by calumnies, and as he has quite recently done against Father Vaillant. I though that I would forestall him, in order to prevent the effect of his threats; and I certainly would have prevented it had our complaints, which I had addressed to you, been laid before his Majesty, as I had begged you, in the name of all our Fathers, to do. But it was my misfortune not to have received that favor from you, however necessary it might have been for all of us missionaries.

He thereby derived all the advantage he desired, in order to be the first to accuse us before the French Court. His recent charges against me respecting my pretended opposition to his establishment at Detroit, you may see in my letter of justification written to the Reverend Father Superior, who will not fail to communicate it to you. Although my innocence prevents my dreading his false accusations, it is however necessary for my protection that you should do now what has not been done in the past.

Although you have not sent my letter of complaint to the Court of France, I cannot persuade myself that you should have deemed it so little worthy of consideration as not to wish at least to keep it so that you might use it in the future to do us justice in case of need. Therefore, having no doubt that you have kept it,

[11] These calumnies of Cadillas were his usual topics at Fort Pontchartrain; they were prominent in his voluminous correspondence with the French officials at Paris.

I beg you to be good enough to place it in the hands of the Reverend Father Superior, to whom I have written to ask you for it in my behalf.

It is the last favor and the only necessary request that I can ask of you before your departure for Europe.

I would myself have gone in person to ask you for it, on the kind invitation that you and madam have been so good as to send me to go down below, in order to give myself the consolation of paying my respects to you, of seeing you, and of conversing with both of you previous to your return to France—whither his Majesty recalls you, to occupy the position of Intendant of Havre and all its coasts. But the present condition of my divided mission which I must reunite, does not permit me to leave it in its present condition in order to give myself such consolation.

The assurance which you convey to me, in the most obliging manner possible, that you will always grant me the honor of your friendship to the extent of wishing me to write to you, notwithstanding the distance that there will be between us, about all that shall occur in our missions, and to inform you of all the need that we may have of your assistance—with the same confidence as that with which I have informed you of such need during the fifteen years while Canada has enjoyed the happiness of your presence—such an assurance, I say was needed by me to mitigate the sorrow that your departure was to cause me, and to make it more endurable to me.

Therefore you will still bear with my letters, and, if the extent and multiplicity of your occupations allow you a few moments leisure to enable you to honor me with your responses, such an honor will cause me more pleasure than I deserve.

All your family—yourself, madam, your children, and above all, our little missionary—will ever be dear to me. I shall never forget what I owe to you; and, if I can at least assure you of that of my prayers, and of the sacrifices that I shall offer to God on the altar for your preservation, for your prosperity, and for the happy administration of your Intendence, with all the success that you can desire.

I remain with all the esteem and all the respect that you deserve your Excellency's very humble and obedient servant,

STEPHEN DE CARHEIL,
Of the Society of Jesus.

P. S.—In speaking of the Detroit establishment, I forgot to tell you that during the whole time while the war lasted, the Indians desired that establishment at Detroit; because they always understood that the destruction of the Iroquoian League was intended, and that thereby they would peaceably enjoy all the lands controlled by the Iroquoian Confederacy. But since they have found that far from wishing to destroy the Iroquoian power, we thought only of sustaining it, of befriending the Confederacy by giving it land they considered as their own country, by restoring the Fort of Cataracony, they have completely changed their minds, and no longer look upon Detroit in any other light than that of an enemy's country; and by restoring the fort at Cataracony for Iroquoian benefit, this feeling has become more intense.

And, assuredly they cannot think or judge otherwise; so that those of the Huron nation who remain here and who do not wish to go to Detroit, mistrust those who have gone to settle there, and think that they go there in order to surrender to the Iroquoians, so as to join in the trade with the English.[12]

Father de Carheil in the above letter plays the part of a French *procureur* in the emphatic manner in which he relates the scandalous doings of the Commandants, soldiers and other Frenchmen. Although his iterations may tire the reader, nevertheless, his arraignment of the government officials is such as to place them in a very bad light, historically speaking.

Among other Jesuits who had been associated with Father de Carheil was Fathers Nicholas Potier and John B. Charndon; subsequently the depopulation had become so great at Michilimacinac and at the Island of Mackinac that Father de Carheil, in 1706, abandoned the mission,[13] burned the chapels and mission houses and returned to Quebec. But the Government induced Father James J. Marest to restore the missions at Michilimacinac; the Ottawas

[12] Jesuit Relations, Vol. 65, pp. 189 *et seq.*

who had been drawn to Detroit by Cadillac became dissatisfied to a considerable extent and many of them with their families returned to their former homes on the Island of Mackinac and to Michilimacinac. The Jesuit mission of St. Ignatius at this locality was reopened. In 1721 Father Charlevoix, S. J., as an envoy of the King of France, visited Detroit and the missions on Michigan soil in the West. These finally devolved to the care of the Jesuit Fathers, M. Louis Lefranc and Peter du Jaunay, with headquarters at Michilimacinac.

One of the out missions occasionally visited by the latter was at Arbre Croche. We find his name as a visitor to Detroit at the Huron Mission in 1765.

Both of these venerable missionaries passed to their eternal reward soon after the latter year.

Armand de La Richardie, S. J., who by the exertions of Father Charlevoix was appointed Superior of *la Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, was born in the diocese of Perigueu, France, June 7, 1686. He was of a distinguished family and uncle of the Bishop of Noyon, who was a count and peer of France. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1703, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1721. Volunteering for the Indian missions of North America, he was sent by the provincial of Aquitaine to Canada and arrived at Quebec in 1725. Designated as the founder of the Huron Mission of Detroit, he spent two years at the Huron village of Lorette near Quebec, where, instructed by Father Richer, S. J., he acquired a knowledge of the Huron dialect and then departed for the scene of his future missionary labors.[14]

---

[13] Father Stephen de Carheil, S. J., after his return to the College of Quebec, rested for a while and then engaged in philological work. His biography is thus outlined.

He arrived at Quebec in 1666 and was placed with the Hurons who gave him the name of Aondechété. After his expulsion from Cayuga, he was sent to the Ottawa missions at Michilimacinac. Shea's Missions, note, p. 289.

Who further quotes: "He had sacrificed the greatest talents in the hopes of bedewing Canada with his blood. He labored there indefatigably for more than sixty years. French and Indians regarded him as a saint and a genius of the highest order." Dr. Shea does not quote the writer of the above, but continues his own sketch, by saying: "As a philologist, he was remarkable. He spoke Huron and Cayuga with the greatest elegance, and he composed valuable works in and upon both, some of which are still extant. He died at Quebec at a very advanced age in July, 1726."

[14] The Hurons had a strong castle and a large village below Fort Pontchartrain. They had the best cultivated fields on the strait and raised the finest crops. Father de la Richardie preached to them, but at first without results and he became discouraged; but he won success by prayer. His influence was such that he subsequently induced them to cross the strait and build new homes at the mission near the Point de Montreal.

As the Recollet fathers of Ste. Anne were in pastoral charge of the people of both littorals of the strait, Father de La Richardie obtained a parochial status on the south littoral and finally established the Huron mission in 1728, at the Pointe de Montreal, which locality is now known as Sandwich, Ont. There he was joined, in 1744, by Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who became his assistant and subsequently superior of the mission.

When Father de La Richardie returned to Quebec, in 1755, he was appointed vice president of the historic college of Quebec, the most ancient collegiate institution which had been established on North American soil in French or British America. His death occurred at the college March 17, 1758. His memory was held in great esteem by the religious of the Hotel Dieu of Quebec, for the services he had rendered the members of that institution during a season of great affliction.

Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who succeeded Father de La Richardie as superior of the Huron Mission of Detroit, differed in spirituality and in geniality from his superior, Father de La Richardie. He is described by Father Arthure E. Jones, S. J., archivist of St. Mary's College of Montreal, who has kindly furnished us with the authentic outlines of these distinguished missionaries of early Detroit, as a great humorist.

The highest dignitaries of Church or State did not escape the shafts of his wit. His personal correspondence is in evidence. Referring in one of his letters to the venerable Henri-Marie Dubreuil de Pontbriant, sixth Bishop of Quebec, who came to Detroit in 1755 to dedicate the fourth church of Ste. Anne, he alludes to this saintly dignitary of the Church as "Monseigneur Mitasse." The latter word meant the long red leggings, heavy and warm, in general use in Canada in winter, suggesting to the reader the antithesis of the light purple hose of the bishop. There are so many witty passages innocently written in *la vie intime*, that might be misconstrued and turned to harm, that the Jesuit custodians of St. Mary's College at Montreal, of his precious manuscripts, deem it advisable not to have them published.

The Huron Mission of Detroit was an extensive establishment. Its Church of the Assumption was finer in its appointments than that of Ste. Anne's of Detroit.

Attached to the mission, and established for the benefit of the Huron Indians, was the Mission Store. It was more heavily stocked than was any trading concern at Detroit; it was managed entirely by a lay brother.

When the Huron braves returned from their hunting fields, the spoils of the chase were brought to the Mission Store. The hunters

were not debauched with *eau de vie*, and their packs obtained at ruinous values, as was the rule with some of the traders at Detroit; they were paid fair prices either in money or in goods. The furs were prepared and sent to the factor of the mission in Quebec, who sent them to Europe, where they were sold by his correspondent to the best advantage. Father Potier was a great favorite in Detroit; his Easter Communion lists, year after year, included the names of the heads of the leading Catholic families of Detroit. We have several of these Easter lists.

He was probably the first Belgian priest who officiated in the vicinity of Detroit. He was born at Bandain Flanders, April 21, 1708. He entered the Jesuit novitiate of Tournai September 30, 1729. He was ordained at Douai 1741. He embarked at La Rochelle for Quebec, where he landed October 1, 1743. He studied the Huron dialect at Lorette under Father Richer, S. J., during eight months and was then sent as assistant to Father de La Richardie of the Huron Mission at Detroit, whom, as stated, he succeeded. We have published a translation and annotation of his *Livre de Compte de la Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, which, written in what Dr. Shea describes as a "microscopic hand," was a rare example of chirography dating back to the middle of the eighteenth century.

Father Potier preserved the autonomy of the Jesuit Order in America, so far as his religious establishment was concerned, until his accidental death in 1781. He had attained the age of 73, and when walking in his study it is presumed he was overcome by dizziness and fell in such a way that his skull was pierced by the ball of the andiron of the hearth. He was found dead in the morning.

The names of the Jesuit fathers who labored on the soil of Michigan between the years 1641 and 1781, with chronological approximation, may be stated as follows: Isaac Jogues, Charles Raymbaut, Gabriel X. Drouillettes, Henry Nouvel, Peter A. Bonneault, Anthony Silvy, René Menard, Louis Nicholas, John Enjalran, Charles Albanal, Peter Bailloquet, Claude Dablon, Louis André, Claude Allouez, John B. Lamorinie, James Marquette, Philip Pierson, John B. Charndon, Stephen De Carheil, Marin L. Le Franc, James J. Marest, Armand de La Richardie, Peter Du Jaunay, Peter Potier, who was the last of the illustrious twenty-four, one of whom was martyred, others who lived the lives of saints, and others whose names have become immortal in the history of America. To these names might be added that of Father Charlevoix, S. J., who spent some time while engaged in spiritual work in 1721 at Detroit, and later on in Western Michigan; as also that of Francis Vaillant de Gueslis, S. J., who came with Cadillac in 1701, but who was promptly recalled by the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec. In the

acknowledged high class histories of North America great praise has been written by non-Catholic writers on these saintly and scholarly priests for their missionary work among the Indian nations, and for their intrepid and extensive explorations of the Western, the Northwestern and the Southwestern regions, which they first explored and scientifically described.

In what relates to the early history of the civilization of what now constitutes the State of Michigan, their share in that work is of glorious record. But they have had detractors! But of these, we propose to mention such only as have been identified with the history of the foundation of Detroit. It is not a grateful task to assail the memory of M. de La Mothe Cadillac, the intrepid founder of Detroit in 1701. If we have accorded his memory high praise for his successful enterprise in planting the lilied banner of France on the North littoral of the strait, and for building Fort Pontchartrain, on whose site one of the finest cities in the West has since been built, it is because Cadillac'e memory deserves such praise. But as to Cadillac's record during the five years previous to his advent at Detroit, the reader is referred to the letter of the saintly Father Stephen de Carheil, S. J., dated at Michilimacinac, August 30, 1702, addressed to de Calliéres, Governor General of New France.

Cadillac, through the favor of Count de Frontenac, was appointed commandant of Michilimacinac in 1694. Father de Carheil had had control of the several Indian missions centering at Michilimacinac. He had evangelized the Ottawas and the Hurons, and had obtained Christian control over the majority of the people of their respective tribes. He held this jurisdiction until his spiritual constituents became demoralized, after the advent of the Commandants and their limited squads of soldiers. One would infer that the post of Commandant at Michilimacinac involved military duties only. *This should have been the rule.* But the fact was that the officers sent there to command became traders, as well as the soldiers under them. Before their advent the traffic in *eau de vie* with the Indians had been limited. Cadillac before proceeding to his post as Commandant, as has been stated, had borrowed from a merchant 3,750 livres, equal to about $5,000 at the present time.[15] This he invested in trading supplpies, the principal part of which included *eau de vie.* Thus equipped, he arrived at Michilimacinac. His career as commandant at the post differed but little from that of his predecessors or successors. Father de Carheil, whose soul was saddened by the debauchery of his neophytes, in sorrowful and indignant words relates the situation to Governor General de Calliéres.

[15] A Sketch of the Life of Antoine De La Mothe Cadillac, Founder of Detroit. By C. M. Burton, 1895, p. 10.

Such is the record of Cadillac while Commandant at Michilimacinac. It cannot be condoned. His opponent, as a factor in the ruin of the Indians and in the debauchery of the Indian women at Michilimacinac, was the Jesuit, Father Stephen de Carheil. The saintliness of this missionary is of history; his words will be accepted as the truth as related in the letter referred to above.

The memory of his experience at Michilimacinac rankled in the soul of Cadillac. When appointed Commandant at Detroit he conceived the design of depopulating Michilimacinac, by inducing the Ottawas and Hurons to leave their homes on the littorals of the islands and mainlands of the upper waters, and come down and build new homes in the vicinity of Detroit. This plan was suggested to the Court of France, as the method of centralizing and organizing the Indian tribes of the West, to be controlled by France at Detroit, as a barrier to the inroads of the Iroquoian Confederacy. But the animus of Cadillac may be inferred by his averment that he would not leave Father de Carheil a member of his flock to bury him. Such indeed became the result of the exodus of the Ottawas and of the Hurons to settle at Detroit. With other Indian nations the centralization at Detroit became considerable. Several thousand Indians came there and located their cantons in the vicinity; while Michilimacinac, erstwhile an Indian missionary centre, became as such, a dreary reminder of the past.

In time the saintly Father de Carheil, in despair, decided to burn his missionary chapels and to return to Quebec. Thus was the labor of many years of Christian work at Michilimacinac, by devoted priests, temporarily suspended during the first decade of the eighteenth century. Thus was the boast of Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac, former Commandant of the post of Michilimacinac, verified.

It is to be regretted that an outline of these events, not in accordance with the relation of facts, and written with a pen at variance with the whole truth so far as Catholicity is concerned, should have been given a place in the printed records of the history of Michigan.[16]

In this connection it occurs to us to say that no local writer has devoted as much valuable time, or has published such accurate details of the history of Detroit and of "its dependencies," as has Clarence M. Burton; certainly no one has expended as much money as he has for the transcription of documents and records here, in Canada and in Europe, covering a period of 200 years. While his collection of Americana is second to none in the United States.

[16] C. M. Burton in Historical Collections and Researches Made by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, Vol. xxix., 1901.
Detroit.

But as a historian of local affairs, we are compelled to say Mr. Burton has one great failing: he does not write impartially in what relates to events in Catholic history; while he accepts and repeats the most inconsistent slanders against the Jesuits.

This is but too evident in his memoir of Cadillac. The archives of the Marine and Colonies at Paris contain a large collection of documents relating to Detroit, the greater number of which were written by Cadillac. These documents were read and considered in the cabinet councils of Louis XIV., while the notes and comments on their respective margins are not, as a rule, creditable to the estimation in which the Commandant at Detroit was held by the ministers of the Grand Monarch. Such notations as: "He lies like a Gascon" is an index of the impression the reading of his tiresomely long documents created.

Cadillac's animosity against the Jesuits is in evidence in his communications to the government of France. When a partially successful attempt was made to burn the establishment near the fort, by which the chapel, the rectory and other buildings had been consumed, he did not hesitate to say that the incendiary had been sent expressly by Father de Carheil from Michilimacinac.

Other happenings detrimental to the welfare of Detroit were ascribed to the malevolent machinations of the Jesuit fathers.

Richard R. Elliott.

Detroit, Mich.

THE ENGLISH EDUCATION BILL: GETTING BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES.

DURING the heat and stress of the debates over the Infallibility question, the opponents of the theory prophesied many dismal results should it ever be embodied in a formal definition and declared to be an article of Catholic faith. Amongst others, it was predicted as an absolute certainty that the rift between religion and the State, in regard to education, would become wider and wider with the advance of time, until at last the serpent of Secularism would devour all competing ones. In England, it was foretold, such must be the inevitable outcome. Time is a relentless dealer with rash vaticinators. Prophecies of such a kind appear to have their origin in the logic of rationalism, which by a peculiar form of irony, seems at times capable of overturning its own foundation-claim, which laughs at all pretensions of prophecy, as at everything else which does not rest on ascertained facts or tangible basis.

The secular principle did triumph for a little while in England, no doubt, because the adherents of the school of Mill and Herbert Spencer got control of the Education Department. Mr. Fawcett, a very able administrator, long directed the policy of that important branch of the Government, and Mr. Forster, who succeeded him as leader in this field, although a religious man and son of a distinguished Quaker, felt himself unequal to the task of battling with the secularists when it came to the framing of new laws for the public schools. It was he who invented and introduced the device known as the "Conscience Clause" to meet the objections of the secularists to any modicum of religious instruction as part of the public system.

Secularism has had its day. For many years it has been predominant in the formation of State policy in England, and the revolt from it which has convulsed the country almost to the verge of civil war is the best criterion of its effects. The population has sunk, not risen, in the moral scale. Infidelity has been proved to be the fruitful parent of crime. Statistics more appalling than the criminal ones for England, for the past year, have seldom been compiled. In London especially the increase in the worst forms of crime has been not merely frightful in its amount but in the character of permanency which it has assumed. The same tendency which is observed in the law of increase in the price of necessary commodities appears to pervade the ratio of criminal extension in Great Britain: ground gained is securely held and there is no retrogression. Such was the depressing keynote of the Registrar-General's last official report.

When one beholds a simultaneous increase, on the one hand, in the number of those who receive free education at the hands of the State, and on the other of those who incur the penalties of the law by the indulgence of their criminal instincts, is it fallacious to adopt the inductive process in seeking the causes of such a disquieting phenomenon? It is surely a startling hypothesis that the phenomena of increasing crime is attributable to the increased knowledge which the population acquires through the spread of the school system. But we cannot alter the logic which facts and statistics furnish. It is demonstrated by the analyses furnished by criminologists both in the United States and in Great Britain that the proportions between illiteracy and criminality are so unequal as to afford no ground for the argument that the one has any real relation to the other. Education, it is further permitted to hypothesize, is in itself conducive to the indulgence in crime, by sharpening the intellect and discovering new opportunities for the ingenuity of the wickedly inclined to develop its maladroit powers.

English statesmen and philosophers have never displayed any particular willingness to concede any superior virtue to the system

which operates in the neighboring island. They often admit that the social condition of Ireland is highly satisfactory, and they cannot alter, if they would, what their own officials in that country have to prepare for the information of Parliament. Yet, though silence is maintained on the subject of causes, they cannot but reflect on the comparative conditions. Ireland is amongst the poorest of countries, while England claims to be the richest. According to the theories of Mill and the materialistic school, the population of Ireland ought to be among the most criminal, while that of Great Britain should show the moral effects of prosperity and contentment in a meagre bill of criminality. The secular principle in education had been rejected in Ireland; it was not suited to the genius of the people. Religion is taught in the National schools, somehow: Whateleyism has been defeated. But in England the secularist has had the upper hand for a long time. Here were factors in the problem to which no clearly thinking man could possibly shut his eyes when entering on its consideration.

But there is more than secularism in the question, so far as England is concerned. There was active infidelity, as well as the negative form inherent in mere secularism. An inquiry into the working of the "Conscience Clause," begun about seven years ago, disclosed so alarming a state of things among teachers that the Catholic Bishops of England, a few years ago, when the previous Education Bill was under the fire of discussion, passed in joint session a resolution embodying their solemn belief that unless something were done to arrest the spread of agnosticism, the country must relapse into paganism. For that reason they gave their adhesion to the Bill, unsatisfactory though it was in many respects. The principal point of difference between that Bill and all those which preceded it was in the provision under which State aid was granted to all Voluntary Schools which came up to the requirements of the central Education Board in the secular branches of knowledge. Previously the rule of the Education Board had been to recommend no grants from the Treasury except to the schools directly controlled by that Board and conforming in all things to its curriculum, as arranged in London. Religion was strictly excluded from that curriculum, in order to satisfy the objections of Nonconformists to the Church of England teaching. The number of these Voluntary Schools was great, and their poverty was great in proportion. The Bill was intended purposely to rectify the injustice of depriving them of their proper share of the school rate because they preferred a religious basis in education to the coldly secular system insisted on by the Radicals. But, with singular inconsistency, the hierarchy of the Established Church declined to follow this leading in defense of a common

religious principle. While a group of Bishops of the northern dioceses drew up a manifesto in favor of the Bill, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London drew up a protest against it. The latter gave as reason his objection to parents being given any voice in the religious teaching of their children, as contemplated in the principle of the Bill! Surely no stickler for State ownership of the child, body and soul, could make any advance on this position.

In assenting, as it did some twenty years ago, to the principle of local School Boards, the State abandoned the position which it had occupied for the previous couple of decades on the question of popular education. No longer did it claim exclusive power over the whole system, on the ground that it possessed the lawful control in the disbursement of all the public moneys. The rights of local taxpayers had come to be recognized, and going down deeper still, the rights of particular religious denominations among the general body of taxpayers. The State abandoned every claim but the right of securing that a certain uniform level of mundane trainnig be maintained in the general school system, as a condition of obtaining a share of the general taxation. On the surface, this was a surrender of all claim to jurisdiction by the State, so far as the spiritual side of the question was concerned. In reality it did not amount to much, since power was reserved to the central Education Board to reject teachers in Voluntary Schools on the ground of unfitness, even without stating any specific unfitness in support of the objection. The grip of the State, through the hirearchy, was still further sought to be maintained in the previous Bill, by the clause providing that the Education Department was to be the judge of what was "reasonable" and "practicable" in the arrangements to be made in any specific locality, for the teaching of religion in the Voluntary Schools.

Nonconformists were perfectly logical, according to their peculiar ideas of logic, in the strenuous opposition they offered to this proposal of the Government. They have no creed of their own but non-creed; they are the representatives of the go-as-you-please ideal of Christianity, the francs,tireurs of the great army, acting under no commander and subject to no commands or discipline. The plan to introduce the principle of denominational teaching, under the rule of the majority, appeared to them monstrous and revolutionary. And yet, if these same people stand for any principle in civil and political life, it is for that of the rule of the majority in representative government. What could better illustrate the infinite complexity of the human mind, the measureless elasticity of self-persuasive reasoning? What, except, indeed, the objection of the State Church Bishops to any parental control over the child's education?

Although the Salisbury Government was unsuccessful in its attempt to reconcile these conflicting views at that time, the fact that its successor, the Government of Mr. Balfour, found it necessary to return to the task is proof of the growth of the sentiment in favor of a return to the religious principle which confounds the vaticinations of the pessimists of thirty years ago. The Infallibility dogma has been the means of strengthening the framework of society, instead of impairing it, as predicted. Its influence is indirectly confessed in the confession of failure of the secular system in a great Protestant country, while the desperate endeavors of those who still adhere to that system, as in France, to extend it wider and wider, bears testimony to its power by the negative evidence of the dread with which it inspires these atheistical zealots. Remote, indeed, the connection between the dogma and the new Education Bill may appear; but time is working out the syllogism. Since it is found that religion is indispensable to the welfare of society, so it must ultimately be manifested that authority is indispensable to religion. The very multiplicity of sects affords a mathematical demonstration, so to speak, of the truth of this proposition; and a still more convincing test is seen in the deflection of the Anglican compass toward the Roman pole. What can be the meaning of the claim to the title Catholic, the adoption of the Catholic ritual, the profession of the Catholic sacraments, the denial of any sunderance of community, the pretended validity of the apostolic succession, but the irresistible leaven of primal authority working its way in the ecclesiastical body? The yearnings of the soul after immortality are not stronger than the yearnings of worship for authoritative direction and inerrancy in the formulation of the truths of which the forms of worship are the symbols.

It is one of the strange revenges which time often brings that those who now complain of the Nonconformist opposition to religious teaching in the public schools had been in the past leagued together to maintain a system in Ireland which had no place for God in it. One of the devices by means of which it was hoped to eliminate Catholicism in that country in process of time was the foundation of a system of Model Schools, as they were styled, for the training of teachers and the development of scientific pedagogy. After a few years it began to be perceived that the system did not fulfil the intial conception of those who proposed it, while the class of teachers which it turned out proved in many cases obnoxious to the Irish hierarchy and priesthood because of the tendencies with which their non-religious training naturally imbued them. A cry for their abandonment arose from several quarters, but the Government at that period was dogged in its adhesion to the secular idea, and the

deaf ear it turned to this cry was in no small measure due to the support it received from the great body of Bishops and clergy of the Protestant Establishment—(it was prior to the abolition of the Irish branch thereof)—who invariably resisted every proposal to recede one iota from even the most untenable position so long as such a recession indicated the confession of a mistake in the Protestant strategy. A memorial praying for the retention of the Model Schools as a public charge was prepared and received the signatures of no fewer than 2,754 "members of the United Churches of England and Ireland"—episcopal, clerical and lay—and solemnly forwarded to Parliament and laid on the table of the House. It is a little late in the day, no doubt, but at the eleventh hour the sin of these unfaithful servants is beginning to find them out. Some of them are still alive, we may certainly surmise, and they cannot but feel the operation of a retributive justice in the violent opposition of the Nonconformists to the measure on which the hopes of the English Church are now centred.

But the Nonconformists themselves cannot escape from the imputation of inconsistency in this momentous concern. While they object to the expenditure of public money on religious teaching, they made no complaint about the religious instruction which was given in the Board Schools, toward the maintenance of which the public money had been going for years. The Bishop of Salford, in a trenchant letter, put the question why this inconsistency was shown, and as no satisfactory answer was likely to be forthcoming, he furnished one himself. The religion taught in the Board Schools, he pointed out, was of the "nebulous and fragmentary" kind. It was like the earth at the dawn of creation—formless and void. This is precisely the species of religion—if one may so style it and be accurate—which suits the theory of Nonconformity. It was entirely fitting that this rebuke should come from a representative of the Catholic body in England; there was no other party to the controversy, either the Government, the Anglicans, or the Dissenters whose record was clean in the matter of consistent principle, consistent claim, or consistent opposition.

The cardinal change sought to be effected by the present Bill—(it will be an Act before these lines see the public light)—is the abolition of the School Board. In every locality this Board was to be abolished and its powers transferred, with new conditions, to the local Education Committee—as in the United States—the appointment of which was to be in the hands of the District Council: in other words, the Local Government body. It is only the secular teaching in such schools (formerly the Board Schools) that is subject to the will of the Education Committee, and this committee in

turn, all over the whole network of Local Government districts, is subject to the control of the central authority in London, the Board of Education. Over this there is no control save that exercised by Parliament, to whom it has to furnish an annual report and to render obedience in matters of policy no less than in those of detail and procedure. What the Bill proposes to do with regard to the Board Schools forms only one branch of the grievance which the Non-conformists detect in it. In respect of another set of institutions—namely, the Voluntary Schools—which figure much more largely in the educational work of the country, the principles of change, as originally proposed, were no less objectionable to the peculiar ideas of the Dissenters. The Voluntary Schools are far more numerous than the Board Schools—if we may judge from the respective numbers on the rolls of each class. While the Board Schools show a total of 2,662,669, in attendance, according to the latest report issued, the Voluntary Schools could boast of 3,043,006 on the rolls. Taken in itself, this showing indicates the strength of the sentiment which operated to induce the Government to enter on the task of reform and radical change, since the Board Schools presented far more attractions to the general mass of the people, by reason of the superior efficiency in the teaching staffs they were able to insure, by means of higher salaries and better teaching equipment, than their rivals. This advantage was no light one, as may be estimated from the fact that while the State expended the sum of £2 5s. 2d. annually on each child in the Board Schools, it contributed only £1 15s. 2d. to each Voluntary School pupil. When parents were prepared to forego the benefits represented by such a difference in cost in order to secure for their children a course of religious training definite in character instead of "nebulous," a condition of public sentiment was revealed which only statesmen of the calibre of Combes and Waldeck-Rousseau would have the temerity to ignore.

Prior to the passing of the last Education Act (Mr. W. E. Forster's) the position of these Voluntary Schools was deplorable. They received no share of the public school fund, and were entirely dependent on private support. Their teaching staffs were much inferior to those of the Board Schools, by reason of the more generous pay these were enabled to offer, while in maintenance of the fabric and the apparatus of pedagogy their condition was sadly inferior to that of their powerful competitors. As soon as they developed a teacher of more than average excellence off he or she hied to the Board School staff, and the vacancy had to be filled by some one of more or less imperfect attainments in the same field. How the Voluntary Schools contrived to attain their present status as to number and attendance is something little short of a wonder, when

one considers the immense drawbacks under which they labored in the pursuit of their mission. No Voluntary School was allowed to be erected, with the view of getting State aid, wherever there was a Board School in existence. This rule gave a monopoly in many districts, for the more favored institution. One of the most sweeping changes proposed by the new Bill is the abolition of this monopoly. Provided parents erect suitable buildings, and the secular education imparted in them come up to the standard set up by the central authority in London, a proportionate grant will be given each school.

A very large proportion of Catholic children have had to attend the Board Schools, rather than the other class, owing to the poverty of their parents; and of this number a very considerable percentage were the children of Irish parents. This fact formed the basis of an appeal made for Irish support for the Bill by Cardinal Vaughan and a number of the English Catholic clergy. Out of this appeal arose a controversy and a division in Ireland which at one period assumed a very embittered tone and threatened the gravest political consequences.

If the question at issue was simply one of supporting or not supporting a measure which brought help to struggling Catholic schools as well as recognition of the principle of religious education, then there can be no doubt but that the Irish Nationalist members would have been false to Catholic principles had they allowed their resentment over political injustice to overcome their allegiance to those principles. But in reality the question was by no means so simple as it looked to those who blamed while they did not take the trouble to examine. Events in England showed that a very different Bill might emerge from the crucible of debate from that which had been cast into the melting pot. So loud were the cries of the Nonconformists, and so apprehensive grew many of the Unionist leaders of the result of the measure on the fortunes of the Unionist and Tory parties, that Mr. Chamberlain was compelled to go down to Birmingham to meet his supporters in conference and to threaten a dissolution were they to persist in the opposition which many of them threatened. The Government would stand or fall by the Bill, he emphatically declared. But this valorous pronouncement was somewhat discounted by the hints which the speaker gave that the Government would not oppose substantial modifications in the shaping of the Bill. How far these alterations might go no man could guess. Moreover, there began to appear in the English press sundry formidable objections to the proposals of the Bill, even from Catholics. It was pointed out that under the provisions of the Bill, as originally proposed, any Voluntary School, in order to secure an

appropriation or a share of the public rates, must be maintained at the standard of efficiency, both as to the building itself, its equipment, and its teaching power, that came up to the Education Department's requirements. This would mean a permanent addition to the cost of the Voluntary School, with no prospect of that addition being made good from any source. But even among the supporters of the Government itself similar apprehensions of disastrous effects to the schools it was intended to help were entertained. Mr. Chaplin, who is no alarmist, but a Tory of the most respectable type, and head of the Agricultural Department, went so far as to speak against the principle of the Bill in relation to the Voluntary Schools, at a meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and to move a resolution declaring "That the cost of education should be borne as far as possible by the National Exchequer and not by local rates." The Education Bill was introduced in the hope that Voluntary Schools would be kept upon their legs for many years to come. It was, he thought, quite likely to have an opposite effect. Owing to the falling off in agricultural values, owners of estates who had built and maintained Voluntary Schools were no longer able to maintain them. It was only human nature that many owners would be disinclined to pay both rates and voluntary subscriptions for the same thing, and therefore the Bill was likely to ring the death knell of Voluntary Schools. It must be owned that such a view, supported by the reasons given by the speaker, seemed perfectly sound and rational. Mr. Chaplin, from his official position, spoke authoritatively: he knew his facts, and his deductions were in accord with human nature and common sense. It would really seem, however, that there was no agreement among the Ministers themselves concerning the spirit and scope of the change they asked the Houses of Parliament to approve and legalize. To the strenuous assertions of the Nonconformists that the Bill proposed to put the whole educational system of the country "under the heel" of the parson and the priest, Mr. Balfour hotly retorted in a public speech. He said that under the existing system in a vast number of parishes there was what was called "a one-man control, being the control of the parson or clergyman of the parish. He asked: "But what is the system which this bill introduces? That is the point. I say that whereas the clergyman of the parish is at present sole manager of the education of his parish, now, under the Bill *he will be one of six.*"

The Bill proposed to add to this clerical manager, priest or parson, five laymen, two of them very likely, in many cases certainly, not belonging to the same denomination as himself.

These proposals effectually disposed of the cry of clerical absolut-

ism on the one hand and the absence of popular control on the other. But the repudiation conveyed in Mr. Balfour's explanations is hardly reconcilable with the behavior of the members of the Government during the progress of the debate. For example, we find in some of the Parliamentary reports that the House of Commons witnessed the strange phenomena of repeated outbursts of cheering on the Ministerial benches over points made by an Irish member in support of the Bill. The member was Mr. T. M. Healy. He was speaking in approval of the courage of the Government in insisting on the right of the parent to have his child brought up in his (the parent's) religion, and in adopting the principle of denominational religious education; and he said, amongst other things:

> It is said that the Church people, having a majority, are anxious to have religion taught in the schools, and the Nonconformists, being in a minority, and believing that the Church religion would be taught in the schools, would remove religion generally from the schools. I do not believe that that is a secularist attitude. Well, now it is said that apparently the Government are a little alarmed and do not venture to take up boldly, according to some of their organs, the question of the necessity for religious education. I feel under no such disability whatever. I believe that the whole reason for these anarchist movements which have disturbed Europe and led to the assassination of the Presidents of the United States and the French Republic have been due to the expulsion of God from the schools.

Loud Ministerial cheers greeted these allusions to the motives of the Government, as the published reports showed. From this we infer either of two things: that Mr. Balfour desired to get credit for establishing the principle of increased popular control over the schools, under the pretext of a desire to aid the poor Voluntary Schools, while his companions in the Cabinet were equally desirous of getting all the credit they could for a sincere desire to restore religion in the schools, as the only means of mitigating the evils which the anarchistic propaganda is bringing on society.

Mr. Healy was a little too generous with the Nonconformists. The Bishop of Salford's estimate of their attitude and their motives seems to be much sounder, as his knowledge of the situation is greater and deeper. It was an exceedingly difficult and complicated problem to take up, when the Government of Mr. Balfour began. Still he himself was pledged to it, and there was nothing to be gained by either abandonment or procrastination with regard to it. The grievances of the Voluntary Schools only grew with delay in coming to their assistance, as Mr. Balfour had promised he would, when the former Education Bill collapsed by its own weight as much as want of backbone on the part of the Ministry that essayed to carry it through. The elementary school system of England, when the new measure was introduced, embraced in all the formidable number of twenty thousand such establishments. Of these only about six thousand were "Secular" schools; the remainder were "Voluntary," or denominational. The latter were maintained

chiefly by private benevolence; the Education Department, under certain conditions, granted a little help. Of all the Voluntary Schools, those belonging to the Roman Catholic system were the most woe-begone. Members of that system in England for the most part belong to the poorest section of the population. Teachers' salaries depended on the number of school attendants. Poor parents are unable to send their children to school with the regularity of the well-to-do; hence in some districts the results' fees of the Board School teacher might be nearly double those of his fellow in the Catholic Voluntary School. It was not merely the monetary loss which affected the unlucky teacher: his professional standing was injured by the low attendance as well. Irregularity in attendance meant also retrogression to the pupil; and when the inspector came around he made two unfavorable remarks on the character of the school, and this meant a double loss to the helpless pedagogue. Catholic Voluntary Schools were, therefore, conducted under the most disheartening conditions; their standard was low; many parents sent their children to the Board Schools in preference. More than one thousand of the Voluntary Schools, notwithstanding these depressing conditions, continued to exist, in some sort of fashion, and it was this fact that moved Cardinal Vaughan to take the bold course of addressing a letter to Mr. John E. Redmond, as chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, soliciting the help of those representatives in the passage of the Bill. Notwithstanding the arbitrary action of the Government which His Eminence asked these representatives to support, in the enforcement of the Coercion Act in Ireland, it was still believed that they would subordinate their natural resentment to their feeling as Catholics, more especially when it was shown that a large proportion of the children affected by the existing law belonged to the Irish section of the population. Not often have political entanglements developed a situation so complicated with the passions of party conflict and the claims of religious obligation. It resembled that crux presented to Desdemona, in the play, when she found herself confronted with "a divided duty."

If no great alacrity was exhibited by those thus uniquely appealed to in acting as implored, it would be unjust to lay their apparent supineness at the door of either indifference or obstinate hostility to the Government which asked for their votes while it scourged their country. It was soon shown to be a wise conservatism. The structure of the Bill was undergoing alarming modifications before their eyes, day by day. The cloud which at one moment looked like a weasel in the next seemed very like a whale. One amendment to the Bill, offered by a military member of Parliament, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, and *accepted by Mr. Balfour*, was so openly at variance

with the professed object of the whole measure—*i. e.*, recognizing and assisting the principle of religion and the right of the parent, in education, that even the *Tablet*, which reflects the views of Cardinal Vaughan, as commonly believed, protested vigorously against the application of this amendment to the Catholic schools. As for the Anglicans, they were simply plunged into a state of hopeless dolor at the prospect conjured up as a result of this amendment, whose passage became almost a certainty once the Government had decided on accepting it.

To understand the alarm of the Anglicans (High as well as Low and Broad Church) over this amendment, it should be understood that many of the Voluntary Schools controlled by this divided body were held under trusts which laid down strict rules as binding on both executors and managers, on the variety of Anglicanism that was to be taught in them. By the terms of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment, the principle of popular control was to modify the laws laid down by the founders of such schools on the subject of religious teaching. According to a Parliamentary return issued recently, while the debate was in progress, there were no fewer than nine thousand of all the Voluntary Schools described as Church of England endowments, which had been erected and maintained entirely out of private resources, and therefore absolutely devoid of any feature which would justify arbitrary interference by the Government or the public with their control or management, whether as to secular or religious teaching. The Kenyon-Slaney amendment would give local authorities power to interfere with this exemption, and would initiate the rivalry between the parson and the layman—the long-standing cause of Bedlam scenes in Synods and annual meetings—in places where the calm of the parson's sway had been for generations unbroken. By the concessions made *prior* to the introduction of this amendment the Anglican losses on the measure denounced by the Nonconformists were thus summed up by an indignant Vicar in the *Guardian:*

1. Our freedom as managers. 2. The *certainty* that we shall be allowed to teach the catechism, or, indeed, *any* religion. 3. The power to dismiss a teacher who, whilst keeping the Church teaching going in the school, entirely neglects the duty of public worship, or is openly antagonistic to the clergy of the parish. 4. The free use of our schools, which we have built, on three evenings of the week. Who is to decide as to which evenings are to be left us? How is this to be distinguished from confiscation? 5. Our endowments are to be confiscated. 6. We are to be responsible for ground rents, hitherto paid out of school funds, and for *all* repairs, down to broken windows and whitewashing. Hitherto most of these have been paid for out of school funds.

We may sympathize with the plight of the Anglicans, in presence of so great an encroachment on their peaceful pastures. But there is in the result some suggestion of the working of that mysterious law which attends apparent success in former revolts against

authority. "Even-handed justice commends the poisoned chalice to our own lips." Their system had its beginning on the encroachments of the secular power on the domain of the temporal; and now they lament most dolefully when the State, in its turn, proposes to interfere with prerogatives which they deemed secure in perpetuity. They represent the principle of successful confiscation; their Church, like old Babylon superimposed upon older Nippur, has been reared on the spoils of the ancient Church in England.

To many outsiders the attitude of the Irish Bishops over the question appeared a mystery. As a body they made no public sign, but individual members like Cardinal Logue, the Bishop of Elphin, and a few others had written or spoken something to show that they were in accord with Cardinal Vaughan's appeal. But this inaction was only apparent. In reality they had been acting in the wisest way. So far back as the 6th of October last the Bishops of Clonfert and Waterford, on behalf of the Standing Committee in session at Maynooth College the previous day, had written to Mr. Redmond as chairman of the Irish Parliamentary party to intimate the wish of that committee (representing, presumably, the whole, or the great majority, of the episcopal body) that the letter of His Eminence be favorably considered at the regular meeting of the Irish members then about to be held. Mr. Redmond's reply to that communication was sent the following day; but it was not until the 28th of November that either of these documents saw the light in the public press. This delay might seem extraordinary were it not for the fact that the correspondence assumed for the time a confidential character. In Mr. Redmond's letter it was pointed out to the Irish prelates that it was the practice of the Irish party, in such cases as formal deliberations over the course to be taken by the party as a whole, to keep the decision taken secret until the time came to act, so as to leave their adversaries in the House of Commons in doubt as to the side on which their votes would be cast in critical emergencies. At the same time the party candidly stated the view that, grievous though the wrongs of the Catholics in England might be under the school laws, the Catholics of Ireland had to endure far more serious injustice in consequence of the failure of the Government to deal with the claims for National Self-government, a Catholic University, and the agrarian problem—all of which affected the very existence of the Irish people in their own country. If the Irish members were found willing to condone such grievances, Mr. Redmond went on to say, the inevitable effect of such an attitude must be to destroy their influence as a party and expose them to the contempt of the Government and the British people. It cannot be denied that such a view of the case was in accord with the historical aspect of constitu-

tional development through political parties. Ireland has had the most disastrous experience of the unwisdom of that statesmanship which would seek through open alliance with British parties or Parliamentary groups to attain national ends. It is to be assumed that the Irish Bishops, or at least some of them, were not insensible to the force of this reasoning. Their action did not seem to be unanimous or decided, as debate went on. This, indeed, was not to be wondered at. Chameleon-like changes were going on before all eyes as the struggle at Westminster began to develope the resources of the opposition and the pliability of the Government. Passions and interests that had not been dreamed of began to start up in a thousand directions. The *odium theologicum*—the last thing the Government would have cared to invoke—suddenly showed itself, so that Parliament toward the end of the first stage of the Bill found itself suddenly threatened with the portentous problem of High Church or Low Church, and wandering in a labyrinth whose intricacies might lead in the end to the path of disestablishment for the Church which tries to sit on both stools. The Ministry was placed in a pitiable plight, now giving a sop to the High, now to the Low; anon throwing a bone to the lay commoner, again placating the country squire—the "lay impropriator" as he has been called, in many places—by giving him a voice potential in the management of the local school. The Bill, as a result of these mal-dexterous manœuvres, assumed a shape almost the converse of that which it bore at the beginning. Starting out with the avowed purpose of relieving the Voluntary Schools, it ended its course—for the time—by giving to the opponents of these schools everything they demanded, all at the expense of the denominationalists. This pathetic surrender was explained by Mr. Balfour as the result of the agitation gotten up by the Nonconformists. The Ministry, he told the House of Commons, were "actually stunned" at the volume and strength of that agitation. This was a humiliating admission for any persons claiming to be regarded as statesmen to make. Mr. Balfour would not deny that he claims to be a statesman. He has now been more than twenty years in the front ranks of the British Ministerialists, doing the highest sort of governmental work. Men called upon to fulfil such duties ought certainly to have an intimate knowledge not only of the material condition but of the sentiments of the people for whom they legislate. After Mr. Balfour's confession, such a view must be accepted with reserve.

The situation, immediately before the Bill had been rushed through the Commons by means of a merciless closuring of debate, was thus eloquently summarized by a distinguished English priest: "It (the Bill) deals most ungenerously with denominationalists; for

them it means a maximum of sacrifice and a minimum of advantage. In spite of this we are willing to accept it; but when the day of reckoning comes we are not likely to forget that we have been betrayed by a Government that was pledged to do us justice. And any one who carefully weighs on the one hand the signal advantage that the Bill confers on Nonconformists, the Nonconformist grievances it remedies at the expense of denominationalists, and on the other how it increases the burdens of denominationalists, and leaves their grievances unredressed will be disposed to think that the Bill may be not incorrectly described as 'The Noncomforist Relief Bill of 1902.'" Mr. Balfour himself had almost paraphrased this description of his great measure, in a public speech. Such being the case, it is little wonder that the propriety of supporting it should not have been very clear to Irish Catholic members of Parliament.

As for the Catholic schools, there is no justification whatever for the application of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment to these establishments. Cleric and layman are not at odds as to the doctrines taught in them. If lay influence was to be introduced as the price of State aid in the secular work performed by these schools, the singular spectacle would be presented of a number of gentlemen undertaking to dictate in matters of which they had not the smallest knowledge, and to which they were in sentiment, and mayhap in practice, hostile—since necessarily, being chosen on the elective principle as representative ratepayers, they must in English constituencies, be chiefly taken from the non-Catholic body.

But if Irish Catholic members were expected to lend their support to the Government in passing the Education Bill as a whole, whatever its ultimate shape, it is difficult to see how they could be asked to help in passing it with the Kenyon-Slaney amendment tacked on. If for the sake of a paltry contribution from the public rates the principle of interference with Catholic teaching were to be sanctioned, where would be the gain? In any event, the gain would seem to be altogether problematical, since the standard of repair and efficiency insisted on as a *sine quà non* to the granting of local or State aid must entail additional expense to an amount altogether beyond the possibilities of surmise. They were blamed for not attending to help to defeat that amendment; but suppose in defeating it they also defeated the Government, and so lost the Bill, what would have been said of them?

Down to the last moment the uncertainty over this measure can be compared to nothing more illustrative than the fluctuations of the race for the Derby. In rapid change of view, in the alternations of hope and fear, now on this side, now on that, in readjustment of proposals to altered situation, no Parliamentary struggle in contem-

porary history presents such kaleidoscopic transformations as the course of this singular measure. It is gratifying to chronicle that there was no eventual break between the Irish episcopate and the political representatives over it. Undecided as to the situation as they were, the latter yielded to the Bishops' opinion that they had better be in their places, ready to safeguard Catholic interest, when the final chapter was reached. They were back in Westminster just in time to meet the Bill on its return from the House of Lords, after passing through the Committee stage there, with several amendments of a mischievous character—from a Catholic standpoint—tacked on. These the Irish party with much cheerfulness assisted in defeating. Immense efforts had been made by the Anglican bishops and clergy to get the House of Lords to make such alterations in the Bill as would diminish the Nonconformist victory or avert some of the evils which they foresaw as a result of the measure passing in the shape in which it had left the Lower House. A protest against the Bill was drafted, and a copy was sent to every member of the House of Lords. The Peers were told that if the Bill passed in that shape, many of the poorer schools would have to be closed. The Bishops in the House protested strongly, but they seem to have been almost alone in their opposition, since when the division on the second reading was taken there were only thirty-seven "noes" to a hundred and forty-seven "ayes" among the Peers. What the nature of the amendments agreed to in the "gilded chamber" had been, we know not at this writing, but they must have been damaging to the Voluntary principle else the Irish forces would not have joined so readily with those of the Government to overthrow them. Although the managers of Catholic schools were crying out that Mr. Balfour had betrayed them, by yielding everything that the Nonconformists demanded, the path of duty still seemed to point in this direction. As these schools could not have increased financial support unless at the cost of abandoning some control, it was deemed best to secure that support for the present and trust to time and a more favorable opportunity to bring about a redress of the unequal balance.

To sum up: it is plain that though the British Government, by the introduction of such a Bill, has acknowledged the necessity of religious instruction, and thereby paid tribute to the principle which the Catholic Church never abandoned, it has, for the sake of victory in the fight, gone nearly as far to taking away with one hand what it gave with the other as any disciples of the rule of expediency possibly could.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE LITERATURE OF DIRT, DOUBT AND DESPAIR.

THE alliteration in the above title may seem both captious and fanciful, yet it is anything but artificial. Read Naturalism for Dirt, Agnosticism for Doubt, and Pessimism for Despair; and at once you have the philosophic and literary terms for three diseases which ravaged the literature of the last century to a frightful degree, and still threaten further evils. The average reader and student hear very little of them under their proper names. There has been long and heated discussion of the decadence of English literature during the last twenty years; and also of the confusion existing among the leading men of letters, a confusion of thought, of methods, and of ideals. Decadence and Confusion are two very apt words, which nicely describe the results of the three *isms*. They are the children of Dirt, Doubt and Despair in current literature. Used without proper reference to their parentage, however, they conceal, for the average reader, their shameful origin.

It is not difficult to follow the decline of originality and power in English letters for the past quarter of a century, since the facts are notorious. Tennyson and Longfellow have left no successors; neither have Carlyle and Lowell; and the same thing may be said of Dickens and Thackeray. The industry of present writers, in the matter of quantity, is beyond praise. The literary prizes are valuable. Never was the demand for good and bad literature so large and so full of profit, never has style been so appreciated, never has the world been so willing to recognize genius. Yet genius does not abound. On the contrary, mediocrity has taken its place, as is well known, and men ridicule it without mercy. What it lacks in genius is made up for by pose. Zangwill, an English writer, said of the modern play that it consisted of snivel, drivel, and devil. It may be said of the modern writer that he is made up of much prose and more pose. The pose is a necessity. The banjo-poets, the mandolin-novelists, and the hurdy-gurdy essayists of the time, as one is tempted to name them, must make a large appearance, if they are to persuade the world of their ability. The English literary world has become a gigantic vaudeville, where continuous performances give us varieties of cleverness, but nothing sublime. So sound an authority as Mr. Kipling has lamented this decline, and hoped that its cause might be found, and the descent checked.

In a question so complex causes are not to be traced easily, even when the conditions are favorable. Here there are no favorable conditions. Confusion reigns in the literary world more absolutely than in the religious. The Church still dominates the religious

world of thought, and disputants usually argue for or against her; but a pleasant anarchy in the literary kingdom makes every writer a little king. The critics naturally have attempted to account for the decline, and have failed as naturally, because they have been most affected by it. Good literature develops good critics, but good critics do not develop good literature. When decline or decadence comes, the critics are the first to show the symptoms. At the present moment it is to be feared that they are a hopeless crew, so fallen into routine as to be of one pattern, like jumping-jacks; get their pegs and their strings and all will jump together the same way. For example, they have been discussing for many years the threatened Decadence and the existing Confusion. How much have they contributed to our knowledge of the causes? One must believe that the lights of criticism know something of the causes; but the flood of minor criticism, which for two decades has been deluging the magazines, reviews and literary histories, has carried no information in its tide. The mental condition of the average reader, after a course in current criticism, must be very curious. His knowledge of the literary past has been gained from the popular histories and the entertaining articles of Edmund Gosse in the reviews, two sources of inextricable confusion. His acquaintance with the literary present is made through the book magazines, and the reviews in the daily and weekly journals: their contradictions, innumerable and cheap, have a rich source in ignorance, in laziness, and sometimes in venality. His acquaintance with the current literature of foreign countries comes through the fine-flavored descriptions of publishers who are selling translations of Zola, d'Annunzio and others of that tribe. Moreover, the honest and sincere criticism of capable men is not only rare, but often vitiated by their point of view, which corresponds with a subjective, not an objective, standard of taste. Therefore, the condition of the average reader is most pitiable.

One is bound to admit at the outset the difficulty of rescuing him, of leading him out of the confusion and explaining to him the cause of decadence. For the Catholic, the task is simple enough: since both decadence and confusion are the logical result of the attempt to get rid of The Christ, that is, the Christian principle, in literature. There is no need to discuss the history of the assault made by the great writers of the last century on the Christian principle. It is a well known matter; what the consequences have been is not so well known. The Christian reasons somewhat in this fashion on the question: literature may be defined as the expression, in the most exquisite forms of speech, of man's thought and feeling about his own destiny: the beliefs and hopes of men shape largely their literature: the more nearly and perfectly a literature expresses the faith

and hope of a people, the closer will it come to perfection; now, it is an historic fact that the principle which, almost exclusively, has informed modern literature, and the standard set for that literature, are the gift of Christ to mankind: the standard is His philosophy of the spiritual life, whose horizon is eternity, whose essence is immortality: the principle is Himself, to quote His own words, I am the way and the life: therefore, the nearer a literature keeps to Christ, the greater will be its perfection: neglect of Him means decay, and hostility to Him means destruction, truths expressed by Himself in the prophetic sentence, he that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth. This rather brief summing up of the Christian reasoning has at least the merit of clearly locating the Christian position. It may be strikingly illustrated by historical instances. The Emperor Julian rejected Christ as a principle for all departments of human activity, and turned to the old order of things for a principle of regeneration; Arius asserted the sufficiency of human genius for the rehabilitation of man; Mahomet declared the incompleteness of the work of Christ; Luther affirmed the defectibility of the organization, the Church, which Christ founded: and the four failed disastrously in the sight of all men. As nothing human moves without a principle, which alone can determine the method, the modern enemies of Christ, like those mentioned above, have been forced to find a substitute for Him in politics, in art and in letters. The effort has been quite as disastrous to the men of letters in our time as to the men of old. It has led to confusion and decadence. Many principles have been tried, of which the three most important have been chosen for discussion in this article. It is profoundly interesting to see what great minds have accomplished with such frightful principles as Dirt, Doubt, and Despair.

Let us begin with Pessimism, as the least important and least successful. It is the name of a theory of existence which holds that our planet is about the worst any creator could have made. A contemplative, well-fed and wealthy German popularized it among thinkers and readers some eighty years ago in Germany. Schopenhauer is a name that one could conjure with in New England fifty years back, and it still commands respect with a few. This worthy philosopher, applying his theories to human life, proposed as the secret of happiness that man should cultivate *the will not to live*. His philosophy for a time had some vogue on the continent, and, as a substitute for the Christian theory, finally made its way among English-speaking peoples. Its principle may be stated thus: this world is man's grave; and its chief postulate: the world should be enjoyed. But a very brief experience proved its unfitness for the optimistic,

active and successful populations which speak the English tongue. As far as I can discover only one direct attempt was made to popularize Pessimism as a literary principle in this country, and that was the work of an ambitious professor of philosophy, Mr. Edgar Saltus, whose latest effusions appear regularly in one of the sensational dailies under such titles as "Hygienic Kissing." Mr. Saltus undertook the task of introducing what he called The Philosophy of Disenchantment into our literary life, both in the shape of the essay and the novel. The essays were dull, and the novels vile, and both failed financially and artistically. However, pessimism has had a large influence, indirectly, through the popular writers whose principles or methods lead finally to despair. Matthew Arnold, George Eliot and Swinburne in England; Thoreau, Emerson and Ingersoll in this country gave it, from different points of view, a distinct impetus. The healthy temper of the people, however, forced these writers to make modifications, at least in the expression of the theory. They adopted, with the exception of Swinburne, the cheerful phrase, courage and candor, as a sort of balance to Schopenhauer's phrase, *the will not to live*. Throughout their utterances one meets constantly the recommendation to meet the situation called life with candor, to lay bare its bleak hopelessness, to recognize its bitter limitations, and to accept them with the courage of the martyr. Mr. Robert Ingersoll, who was not a literateur, but who was a teacher for a stupider class of people than followed the Arnolds and the Eliots, found it necessary to appeal steadily for a lofty development of the affections in man, and to ornament the grave with roses, lilies and white marbles, in order to secure his following, and to keep them enchanted with pessimism. In time the catchword of courage and candor failing to please sufficiently, the gospel of Altruism had to be preached, both for the encouragement of the teacher and the entertainment of the multitude. The last stage of popular pessimism was its general attack on the shams of the age, a trick of politics which is certain to attract and hold public attention for a time.

The effect of pessimism upon the literary productions of its advocates proved its uselessness as a living principle. Arnold never had spontaneity, either in prose or poetry, and consequently his work could ill bear the chilling influence of pessimism. Wherever it dominates his verse, the poems have the frosty outline of old-fashioned tombstones. George Eliot's genius withered under it absolutely; it reduced Emerson to froth, and made Thoreau a gabbler. If it failed as a substitute for the Christian principle, nevertheless it seems to run with the larger part of serious literary effort in the past half century. One finds it as an after-taste in the mouth,

even with so optimistic a poet as Tennyson, even in such vital verse as Browning's. Swinburne accepted it as one accepts the lees in the wine when the cup is finished. With the brutal honesty of his kind he expressed his disgusted conviction promptly, refusing to pamper himself with the catchwords of Arnold and Eliot and Emerson. These sober and serious writers saw the grave from afar, and approached it with dignity; Swinburne found it yawning for the drunken votaries at the very doors of the temple of Venus, and he sang:

Though one were strong as seven
He too with death shall dwell,
Nor wake with wings in heaven,
Nor weep with tears in hell.
Though one were fair as roses,
His beauty clouds and closes,
And well though love reposes,
In the end it is not well.

We are not sure of sorrow,
And joy was never sure.
To-day will die to-morrow;
Time stoops to no man's lure.
And love, grown faint and fretful,
With lips but half regretful,
Sighs, and with eyes forgetful,
Weeps that no loves endure.

From too much love of living,
From hope and fear set free,
We thank with brief thanksgiving,
Whatever gods may be,
That no life lives forever,
That dead men rise up never,
That even the weariest river
Winds somewhere safe to sea.

Then star nor sun shall waken,
Nor any change of light:
No sound of waters shaken,
Nor any sound or sight.
Nor days nor things diurnal,
Nor wintry winds nor vernal;
Only the sleep eternal
In an eternal night.

The second attempt to find a substitute for the Christian principle in literature came into being under the title of Naturalism, and Swinburne was its most enthusiastic and determined promoter. The new principle expressed itself clearly in the formula: nature is sufficient. The world had enough of beauty, and the life of man sufficient strength and variety, to satisfy all needs and inspire the greatest of poets. This was simple, comprehensible to king and clown, universal and everlasting as nature itself. Three men made Naturalism popular and famous: Swinburne in England, Walt Whitman in America, and Emile Zola for the whole world. Each of these men started from his own point of view. Swinburne was a genius as well as a man of pleasure. For him there could be no evasions in aim or method. He understood clearly and accepted cheerfully the apostasy from the Christ, the worship of Venus. Here are his own words in the Hymn to Proserpine:

Of the maiden thy mother men sing as a goddess with grace clad around;
Thou art throned where another was king; where another was queen she is crowned.
Yea, once we had sight of another; but now she is queen, say these.
Not as thine, not as thine was our mother, a blossom of flowering seas,
Clothed round with the world's desire as with raiment, and fair as the foam,
And fleeter than kindled fire, and a goddess, and mother of Rome.
For thine came pale and a maiden, and sister to sorrow; but ours,
Her deep hair heavily laden with odor and color of flowers,
White rose of the rose-white water, a silver splendor, a flame,
Bent down unto us that besought her, and earth grew sweet with her name.
For thine came weeping, a slave among slaves, and rejected; but she
Came flushed from the full-flushed wave, and imperial, her foot on the sea.

Through a flood of splendid and blasphemous verse this poet

arrived speedily at the goal of Naturalism: the grave. His disappointment was as savagely frank as his first enthusiasm, and nothing in his poetry is more terrible than his lashing of his own gods at the discovery of their littleness. Lust and beauty and life and activity were his themes; he sang to them as the ancient poets sang to their deities, with many a bitter fling at Christ and His Mother; until the horror of the grave seized him, and he discovered that for such as he there is no god but death, the extinguisher of life and beauty and lust and activity. When that conviction reached him, Swinburne forsook both gods and poetry, and troubled men no more with his blasphemous songs.

Walt Whitman had the poetic fibre, but one doubts if he ever had the mind to grasp a theory like a philosopher or a Swinburne. Certainly he thought less of principle and method than he did of the deficiency which he had observed in the poetry of the time. It failed to sing the praise of lust with the right attention to details. Whitman spent his energies in supplying the deficiency. He is therefore more obscene than Swinburne, with less intention and desire to be obscene; and at the same time less suggestive, utterly without blasphemy, and often ridiculous. Nevertheless he sang the Song of Dirt loudly and effectively, and pottered away into a foolish old age without ever guessing his relationship to Swinburne, or the good work he had done for Venus. He had no imagination, and no logic, and never saw with the horrified eyes of his English master the yawning grave. These two poets affected only the more cultivated readers, and, while their influence may be more permanent in consequence, it had never the sweep and immediate power which belonged to Emile Zola. The millions read Zola. Swinburne sang only of what he considered the beautiful in Nature; Whitman, with the same thought, but less discerning, included the ridiculous; both poets excluded the repulsive carefully. Zola brought a different spirit to his exposition of life, the spirit of impartiality. He described small-pox destroying one of his characters with as much ardor as Swinburne sang the birth of Venus. He worked indeed upon the same principle, the sufficiency of Nature, but with a peculiar postulate: everything should be told. Now to describe everything without reserve requires exaggeration and much language. The latter produces tedium, and the former destroys perspective. Zola did not seem to have a true sense of proportion, a right idea of perspective. Most of his books leave the impression on the reader of something monstrous, unnatural. Without intending it, he became the greatest exponent of Dirt that any age of the world has seen; not merely the dirt of the brothel, but also of the hospital, the shambles, the sewer, the muck-heap and the dissecting-room. It

seems incredible that a writer of such talent and industry, a man of the world of intellect, should have taken such a course. Swinburne has the excuse of tradition, and Whitman of ignorance. Without precedent or guide Zola cut a road for himself through the backyards of men. And for many a year the big and little critics of the land praised his work, and made his latest book the occasion of an ecstasy.

Apart from the disgust which his stories arouse, a statement of the leading features in any one of his novels is amusing. Thus, in Doctor Pascal a child dies in his sleep from nose-bleed, an old man perishes in a drunken stupor from spontaneous combustion, an uncle and niece fall in love, and the hero dies a slow death from angina pectoris. The reader is entertained in precisely the same fashion as if he sat out each painful scene like an attendant nurse, with the requirement that he report each case to the government. It is a good illustration of the rule to tell everything. The blood drips with terrible monotony from the weak veins of the sleeping child to the table, and from the table to the floor; and the only witness is a crazed and helpless grandmother to whom the sight of blood brings back a long-forgotten horror with a shock that mercifully kills. The old man in spontaneous combustion sits in his chair burning like a smoky lamp, filling the house with putrid odors, deserted by the relative who might have saved his worthless life, but thought nature should be left to its good work. The hero Dr. Pascal passes calmly through each stage of painful heart failure, with purple face and straining eyes, to the end; he has his witness also, the niece whom he loves, whose presence intensifies the anguish of death. One feels that the story is told less as a story than for the opportunity to describe death from slow hemorrhage, spontaneous combustion and heart failure. The limitations of his principle and his method Zola made very clear in his "La Faute d'Abbe Mouret." The aim of this story is to show how in certain conditions the forces of nature and of artificial civilization are almost equally balanced, now one and then the other winning the victory in an endless struggle. The Abbe Mouret, virtuous, devoted, and even experienced young priest, represents the false civilization for Zola; an untrained peasant girl, isolated from her kind, savage and clever, represents the principle, nature is sufficient. As it was to be a story of primitive love, Zola attempted to make it a prose-poem, and succeeded sufficiently to win the praise of the (then less) judicious Andrew Lang. The coloring is sensual to a degree, all the natural scenes are painted with the brush of Venus, and everything leads up to the climax of unconscious sin in a place modeled on the garden of paradise. The chastity of the untrained

heroine is deftly contrasted with that of the faultless Abbe. Zola read all the books in France on the training of a priest, and talked with former students and very retired priests. The result is a remarkable burlesque, which cannot but rouse laughter, and at the same time admiration for the thoroughness of the author's reading. The priest is a wonder of correctness and virtue. Yet nature in an unguarded moment conquers him, but is quickly and cruelly overthrown, while ecclesiasticism riots in cruelty in revenge for one really sinless slip.

The literary character of the tale must have been good to win the praise of honest critics; yet there is nothing falser in the work of Zola than this story, nothing more banal, nothing more offensive to good taste and sound sense. But unquestionably he had power. His study of certain conditions in France was a protest and a warning in the shape of the novel called "Fecondité." It is not really a story, but a state document. Like most of his work it is horrible in its presentation of the under world; nevertheless in this case the horror makes for power; but the effect is weakened by the bad logic, the foul odors of crime, the tedium of six hundred pages, the long period of fifty years. One feels at the close that fifty years of horror and tedium have passed since the book was opened. None the less is the book powerful even in its false contrasts of character and incident. With the mob it might even be an argument against certain crimes. Its descriptions of ideal family life are inviting, and the scenes of horror are painted with something like sincerity. Exaggeration and disproportion spoil all, however; and the determination that the new principle shall succeed in his work makes Zola's atheism and materialism far grosser than Swinburne's, although appealed to less often. The world knows that Zola failed, like Swinburne and Whitman, with his own generation. Few false prophets have received in their lifetime punishment as swift and effective: Swinburne missed the honors of laureate, which were nothing, but the contempt inspiring the slight was much; Whitman passed an old age honored and laughed at; Zola suffered a long agony of annihilation, and saw himself labeled by his own craft as an exhalation of the swamp. The form of the failure has to be taken into account. The three men proved clearly, for the literati as for the crowd, the uselessness of Naturalism as a substitute for the Christian principle. Something of their spirit remained, however, and Zola's postulate became the shibboleth of modern journalism: everything should be told. The postulate deceived the critics, attracted them, and held them for a time; they hailed the new star and with united breath held it in the sky; but when the decent described its true character and called in the police, they suddenly

withdrew both admiration and wind, and let the new star fall back into its native fen extinguished. Swinburne in his retirement must have felt the grim irony of fate in the rise of Whitman and Zola to illustrate broadly in caricature some consequences of his own principle, which he had refused to acknowledge: the merely ridiculous and the cheaply vile. It is well to bear in mind that their naturalism lives in some forms of journalism. In particular Zola may be sung by his admirers as the founder of that form which prints everything, without proportion or perspective, without decency, or taste, or even commercial discretion. One thing should not be forgotten in forming an estimate of the forces of Naturalism: its promoters sing, expound and write from experience, personal and otherwise. Their enthusiasm and other emotions spring less from principle and personal ambition than from actual contact with the pleasures of life as viewed by their kind. This is not considered important by the critics; but the critics close their eyes too often for their own glory. Most writers of the school of style-and-stench ought to be in jail part of the time; their latest representative, the Italian d'Annunzio, is said on good authority to have enjoyed the distinction. The failure of Naturalism, as compared with Pessimism, had considerable dignity; for authority set itself to digging sewers that the filth might flow swiftly and harmlessly into the ocean; whereas dry, correct, elegant Despair perished like a small puddle under a strong sun.

When men tire of false principles, they do not always turn again to the true. In this particular case the failure of Dirt and Despair turned them more positively towards negation. They had agreed that nothing could be got from Christ, that the doctrine of the eternal life with all its postulates and consequences had passed into dreamland. The leaders reasoned that even if such a life existed, even if God ruled in the universe, man could know nothing of these things. Then arose a principle: the Unknowable. Then followed the postulate: nothing should be said about it. And at once, from a mere weariness agnosticism became a positive thing; from a name it became an active principle; and now it is almost a cause to be fought for on bloody battle-fields. What a contrast with Zola's postulate, everything should be told, is the new declaration of dumbness. Yet there is nothing vague about it. Agnosticism, whatever it may be, is the third great and serious attempt to get rid of Christ in literature, and to find a working principle and a sure method in His place.

Its strength at the present moment is drawn from the political and social conditions of the time. The people without religion are now numbered by the millions. Their mental attitude towards religion is purely agnostic: it may be all right, but nobody can know;

and why bother about things unknowable? In consequence the science and the art of politics are now the study and the practice of running a government without God; the management of charitable institutions excludes the religious motive and religious people; the education of the child has been carefully divorced from Christian principle. It would be difficult to name a department of human activity into which the new principle has not wormed itself. Science ignores religion as a factor anywhere, and often treats it as an enemy; journalism is positively hostile in principle, though journalists be Christian; art in English-speaking countries it not merely indifferent, it is purely incapable, in portraying Christian scenes; and history, written from the agnostic point of view, denounces the expulsion of the Arabs from Spain and the Huguenots from France as of the same character, and has no sympathy for the Irish sold in the Barbadoes by Cromwell. One can easily imagine then the effect of the new principle on literature. It is best studied in shining examples.

The leading critics of the day, and the little mob who shout at their heels, have surrendered themselves to it; which accounts for the infinite variety and laughable stupidity of their daily blunders. They applauded Zola and worshiped Swinburne, as now they worship d'Annunzio. By reading steadily the publications in which they thrive one may learn of every literary abomination, or monster, or curiosity on earth, before hearing of Manzoni or Newman. Indeed, one of their finest achievements was the contemptuous ignoring of the great master of English prose, around 1880, while they blew their raucous horns in honor of the newly-discovered Zola. For a list of their remaining glories the student may be referred to the "Ephemera Critica" of John Churton Collins. Following the new principle that religion should be left to the conscience, the home, the temple, and should not intrude into the market-place or the academy, their agreement has been to ignore, condemn and destroy literary work of a religious kind. It is an axiom with them that, where religion steps in literary form steps out. This is not hostility, it is simply ignorance; nor is it the ignorance of accident, but of art. The critics are proud of their condition, which has deprived them of the respect and confidence of their natural clients. Even more curious is the effect of agnostic influences on the writing of men like Howells and Crawford. The novels of Mr. Howells have earned for him a wide and deserved esteem as moving examples of the literary art. They possess one singular defect. All admit that the novel is a transcript of actual life; and Mr. Howells is charged with the artistic fault of too great, too photographic fidelity to real life. His novels are concerned entirely with American life. The whole world knows that Christianity, either doc-

trinally or sentimentally, dominates the lives of our people at present; for they are usually married by a clergyman, die with his ministrations, and are buried in the churchyard. You will never discover any of these facts from Howells' novels. A foreigner, if he drew conclusions from them, would argue that religion was unknown to Americans. One would imagine that the novelist before publication carefully picked out from his stories all the chance expressions that hinted at the religious facts. His books are very fine illustrations of the postulate: nothing should be said about it. Mr. Howells may have no religious faith, but Mr. Crawford is a convert to Catholicity. His novels possess the same defect as Howells', though not so perfectly; they treat often of Italian life and character; but for all that Mr. Crawford has done one might take the whole Italian race for pagans. He has not the same point of view as Howells: he writes for his publishers as well as for his public. But what an injustice both writers do to Americans and Italians, what a failure in artistic power, by their peculiar surrender to a false and insufficient principle.

It is the crowning success of Agnosticism in letters, as in actual life, that in the war against The Christ it has enlisted on its side, not merely the enemies, but the friends of the Saviour: through ignorance or misapprehension, of course. Catholic writers have often submitted to its influence, as in the case of Crawford and others, but without any real need; for a false principle has only to be well fought in the open field to prove itself a weak and pretentious sham. However, for the moment agnostic literaryism is a great success, and, in spite of the signs of reaction, will rise to greater glory before its career comes to a miserable end. Like its predecessors, it is insufficient and repressive, and its horizon is too small. Neither its critics nor its imaginative writers will submit long to a limitation which shuts out from their view the genius of a writer like the Polish novelist, Sienkiewicz. The case of Cardinal Newman is not so much to the point, because national bigotry had its share in keeping his genius in the background. The literary principle of the Pole was aggressively Christian, and so much an instinctive part of his work that he himself could hardly escape it even with conscious purpose. The critics read him, sniffed the air of the obsolete and turned away haughtily. They might have felt the presence of such a magician as Scott, but they declined to accept as legitimate the results gained by adherence to an exploded principle of the literary art. The people forced them to recognize Sienkiewicz. The popularity of his books, even in translation, demanded an explanation, and his influence, growing daily, had to be measured officially. Hence the half-hearted, wholly incompetent reviews of the great

novelist's production. So far the explanation of him has not appeared, and the tape-line of the critics has not yet been lengthened sufficiently to suit his splendid proportions. Strangely enough, the great Longfellow suffered in the same manner, and suffers until this day from the incompetent criticism of the hour. Though he can hardly be called a Christian, Longfellow was so steeped in Christian sentiment, his ideals were so Christian, his literary taste was so instinctively hostile to the erratic and unclean, that his thoroughly Christian poetry became the mark of a criticism maggotty with doubt and despair. Evidently he found no inspiration in the principles which occupied the thought and work of so many of his contemporaries; and his reward has been the affectionate regard of another generation, which looks with indifference on the almost forgotten productions of the same contemporaries.

One may easily see from the very roughness of the outline given in this article how large a subject has been treated in a small space. All the proper shadings have been dispensed with, all the graceful colorings which charm, all the qualifying details so necessary to the artistic presentation of a subject. These would require a volume. However, the main facts are now in full view. Every one knows how wide and deep have been the influences of our greatest and most successful writers; of Arnold, George Eliot, Emerson, Swinburne, Whitman, Howells and others mentioned above; and from that width and depth we can at least guess at the fearful hold upon men taken by the principles from which they worked, principles always antagonistic to Christ, and always helpful to some form of error. Is it cause for wonder that after fifty years of Dirt, Doubt and Despair there should be a decline in literary production, and confusion in the literary world? The wonder is that literature escaped complete ruin. The critics are still discussing the decadence and the confusion in exquisite phrase, substantial as a lady's perfume. They might consider with profit the dictum: he that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth.

JOHN TALBOT SMITH.

New York.

THE SOCIAL BEARING OF ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION.

APART from the moral problem in elementary instruction, there is another of the purely economic social order. The moral problem, namely, how to introduce some instruction concerning the only basis of morality, will not be solved otherwise than by a sincere, unanimous, public, effective recognition of the truth that morality cannot be taught without religion. In the past five years, under the overpowering demonstration of events, voluntary testimonies to this truth have been coming fast, one upon another, even from sources whence we had hardly hoped to look for them. However, this recognition is not effective; it is not productive of results; and it does not promise anything. It comes to us more like the cry of horror at the spectre of the future seen through the transparent facts of the present. Like many other unheeded forebodings, it may be destined to stand merely as a prophetic warning to point back to when the day of reckoning is over. Most often the one who dares to speak a warning is not among those who have remedial power; and too often those who have remedial power reck not of anything but their own personal transient advantage. Thus, often enough, reform movements become theatrical, spectacular, directed to the deception of the multitude—to the pruning away and disinfecting of certain over noisome fruits, rather than to the eradicating of deep-seated and ever fruitful causes. Here is the history of human calamity read between the lines: the echo of pleading voices, fallen as the idle wind upon the ears of those who have dominated dread situations.

But we ventured to assert that there is an economic problem in the matter of elementary instruction. From the latest report of the United States Commissioner of Education, that is, for the school year 1900-1801, we gather that in the sum of all the educational institutions in the United States there is a total attendance of almost exactly seventeen and one-quarter million students. Eliminating the distinction which is made in the report between public and private schools, and making a computation on the basis of grade and specific purpose, we shall find this fifth part of our national population to be distributed as follows:

Elementary Schools	15,856,330
Secondary Schools	856,227
Universities and Colleges	103,251
Professional Schools	55,089
Normal Schools	68,380
City Night Schools	185,000
Business Schools	70,686
Kindergartens	93,737
Indian Schools	23,500

Schools for Defectives	23,601
Reform Schools	24,925
Orphan and other Benevolent	14,000
Schools in Alaska	1,369
Miscellaneous	50,000

Excluding Night Schools, Business Schools, Reform Schools, Asylums, etc., we wish to speak solely of the class that stands at the head of the list, the Elementary Schools. These include what we understand strictly by the name of Ward or District or Parish Grammar or Primary Schools which go directly before the High School. In them we have an attendance of 15,856,330 out of a total student population in all the establishments of 17,225,095. That is to say, they are attended by fifteen and four-fifths millions out of seventeen and a quarter. To use whole numbers: out of every sixty-nine in the total student population there are sixty-three in the elementary school. So that we are perfectly safe in saying that there are fifteen out of seventeen million students who do not get beyond the elementary school, the district and the parish school.

It is conceded by eminent educators that connected with the elementary instruction there is a certain problem which is still awaiting a solution. The editor of the *Educational Review* (Feb., 1902) remarks: "The grammar school curriculum is now the burning question in public school discussions. The more it is discussed, the more will the necessity of reform be made apparent." Professor Dewey, writing in the same *Review* (June, 1901), says that the people will not be slow to provide equipment and resources "when the educators have come to some agreement as to what education is." He says that we have been going through a period of "blind experimentation," of "blind striving," and he continues: "I believe we are now nearing the close of the time of tentative, blind, empirical experimentation; that we are close to the opportunity of planning our work on the basis of a coherent philosophy of experience and of the relation of school studies to that experience." This is, at least, the expression of a belief that we are close to the opportunity of making a plan on the basis of something coherent.

At the meeting of the Massachusetts Superintendents' Association, 1901, Mr. James P. Munroe, of Boston, in presenting his personal estimate of our blind experimentations, said: "Many of the new methods, on the contrary—methods of gently cooing towards a child's inclinations, of timidly placing a chair for him before a disordered banquet of heterogeneous studies—may produce ladylike persons, but they will not produce men. And when these modern methods go so far as to compel the teacher to divide this intellectual cake and pudding into convenient morsels and to spoon-feed them to the child—partly in obedience to his scholarly cravings,

partly in conformity with a pedagogical diet-list dictated by the latest outgivings of physiological psychology—then the result is sure to be intellectual and moral dyspepsia in a race of milksops.

"It is the tritest of saying that there is no royal road to learning; but too many of the modern methods ignore this truism, or, rather, seem to believe that the road can be traveled vicariously by the teacher, who, working to the uttermost edge of her nerves, must perform prodigious intellectual journeys in order to spare a few steps of wholesome drudgery to the unwisely cosseted pupils.

"Nobody else in the world works harder than a baby, and none accomplishes more in the same period of time. The baby, it is true, has the several great advantages that his relatives do not appreciate how hard he is laboring, that he would not understand them even were they to commiserate him, and that he is compelled by nature to do one thing—or, at most, a few things—at a time; devoting himself to just those tasks, without any distraction from without.

"One is now considered to be frightfully behind the times if he attempts to teach the multiplication table and similar things seemingly fundamental to ordinary knowledge; but is it quite right to spare the child these disagreeable labors now if, in doing so, there is laid up for him a store of future trouble because of his ignorance of these memorized facts? . . . The New Education is in danger of providing too much atmosphere and too little training."

President Andrew S. Draper (University of Illinois), in a paper prepared for the Harvard Teachers' Association (1902), said: "'Culture' has been the slogan of recent years. It is important, but strength is still more important. It is very desirable, but it is yet more desirable that boys shall be trained to bear the part of a real man, and girls the part of a real woman. If they are, the culture will come with it.

"We have many of us forced our particular schemes into the work of the elementary school until we have constructed an incoherent and unsymmetrical whole. We have overlooked the fact that it makes not so much matter how much work a child does as that he shall do something exactly and completely, have the satisfaction of accomplishing difficult tasks, and gain the enthusiasm for yet more difficult ones.

"We have shaped the work of the lower schools with too much reference to the demands of the advanced schools.

"We have changed and multiplied the branches taught in the schools until they confuse and confound the homes upon which the great public educational system rests. Parents are unable to enter into the work of their children. It is not because the parents are

so ignorant, but because the work is so changed and complex. There is something sad about this, and there is something more than sad, even dangerous, about it. It lessens the interest of the people in the schools."

And Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews (University of Nebraska) writes *(Educational Review,* March, 1901): "Closely connected with the pupils' dislike for solid reading is the evident disinclination of too many boys and girls after leaving school to make earnest effort of any kind. They have not the power of strong execution. They lack courage, resolution, 'sand.' They are afraid to take the initiative. The typical pupil of to-day must be interested before he can act. The pedagogy of gush has brought him to look to his teacher for interest, not to find it in himself. It is beaten into his head that his teacher must keep him attentive. If a suggested task is not interesting, he cannot think of it as having any claims upon him. Little of the tonic that comes from driving the will to perform unpleasant duties is ever given him."

It will not do for us to make assertions in this matter. Hence we have felt obliged to bring in testimony. We have tried to make it short, and have taken it from but a very few of many respectable witnesses who might have been cited to the same purpose. The purpose has been solely to indicate that there is an expressed recognition of the existence of some kind of an unsolved problem attaching to the elementary instruction. We must ask indulgence, now, for a longer citation, coming as a summary and as an authentic verdict from another competent authority.

In the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association held at Chicago last February, Dr. Paul H. Hanus, Professor of the theory and practice of education, Harvard University, read the opening paper. His subject was: "Obstacles to Educational Progress." He limited himself to the discussion of school programmes. He said by way of introduction: "The recent history of attempted reform in school programmes is quickly told. About twenty years ago the elementary school programme, with its narrow content and overwhelming emphasis on the school arts—reading, writing, arithmetic, and English grammar—was seen to be inadequate and formal. It provided some acquaintance with the school arts themselves, but afforded little real education. It prepared for an elementary education, but did not furnish it.

"Accordingly, rather more than ten years ago, we began to increase the scope of the elementary school programmes. We sought to improve them by "enrichment." To the school arts the formal studies, we added 'thought studies'—literature, history, nature study,

and an improved geography. To the narrow field of the traditional arithmetic we added elementary algebra and geometry; we laid more stress on the drawing, music, and physical training already represented in the schools' occupation; and we introduced manual training, and occasionally a foreign language. But the result was far from satisfactory. We had become convinced that enrichment was necessary, and had acted on our conviction. But the enrichment had involved us in new difficulties that proved to be formidable obstacles to progress. Our programmes were congested, especially in those portions of the new programmes most affected by enrichment—the earliest and the latest pre-high-school grades. The middle ground was and remains, justly, I think, though perhaps not always intentionally, the territory where the school arts are supreme.

"Then it seemed that the elimination of 'non-essentials' from the old programmes would solve our difficulties. Such elimination, it was asserted, must precede and accompany enrichment—which was true; and it was also announced, with something of a flourish and a good deal of insistence, that 'correlation' would accomplish the rest. Correlation was interpreted to mean such a grouping of the subject-matter that each study could and should be so pursued as to cover, incidentally, adequate instruction in others." Dr. Hanus then refers to a committee which was appointed in 1893, and says: "It was understood that one of the committee's most important duties should be to set forth, clearly and in detail, to what extent the problem of our programme difficulties could be solved by correlation." And he adds: "This important study is still awaiting the leisure and inclination of broad-minded students, willing and able to devote a long period of time to it.

"By this time," he continues, "we had attempted 'enrichment,' 'elimination' and 'correlation;' this had effected a more or less thorough-going revision of the programme of elementary studies from beginning to end; and the result was *chaos*. There is no better term to describe the infinite variety, complexity, and instability that resulted from the successive tinkerings to which the elementary programmes had been subjected. And chaotic they remain. But it is no longer a discouraging situation. Before this stage had been reached, we had gradually come to see that what we needed was guiding principles."

The independent judgments of the two very distinguished Professors of Education coincide with such precision in the characterization of a fact. With the one, we acknowledge that for so many long years we have been working without guiding principles; and with the other, that the period in question has been one of blind, tentative experimentation. But what have we been looking for?

Education, of course. We made the discovery that the traditional studies did not educate. Therefore, we begin to enrich, to eliminate, etc., until we got into chaos—where we now are. But why did we not go straight to the mark? Ah, there was the difficulty. Have we not just heard one of the Professors putting this very condition, "when the educators have come to some agreement as to what education is!" You ask, why we do not hold a meeting. We did. That is where the trouble began. We have got too many ideas and cannot carry them out. Our speculations are much directed towards enhancing our neighbor's efficiency; our activity is expended in making an ever-changing composite from the indefinite succession of ideals proposed to us. Truly, one might be tempted in the present conjuncture to inquire whether it would not be wise to interdict all educational conference for a term of years, to throw the teachers back upon their own thoughts for execution, and to leave them to make such impression upon the pupils as they might under the stimulus of their own originality and their own natural mental growth.

The condition referred to by the two eminent Pedagogists is not the affliction of isolated localities, nor is it confined to any one kind of schools. The wave of the blind tentative has swept over the elementary schools from ocean to ocean. Public, private, parish, ward, district, select schools of the elementary class—all, with few exceptions, have been either directly affected or indirectly influenced. There has been, throughout, a vague, pervading fear of being behind the times, of not being in the "swim," and the volume of the wave has been kept copiously supplied from the inexhaustible reservoirs of the vigilant book companies, *et al.* We have changed our books, we have changed our subjects, we have changed our methods. When book and subject and method did not respond magically to our first touch, like the key of a type-writer, and give us the happy result, we betook ourselves, forthwith, to the catalogues of the publishers. And there we found subjects innumerable, and histories and grammars and geographies by the page-full, and a dozen new and infallible methods to try—all of which we introduced one after the other hopefully into our test in expectation of the elusive precipitate, education.

Education! What is it? It is something co-extensive with human capability—with the development, training, cultivation of the sum total of human power. It is something as wide in its objective reach as the field of human activity. From this it follows that when we come to speak of the concrete, of the actual or even possible education of a determinate individual, it is necessary for us to specify. For, no individual, under no matter what training, can arrive at a

high development of absolutely every capability which he possesses. When, therefore, we wish to determine what kind of education is to be given to an individual, it would seem to be wise for us to follow in this the very plain rule which by instinct we follow in everything else, namely, the rule of *looking to the end.* Again, when the education of one person is assumed by another (and the education of the child is always assumed by somebody) said person has a right to be provided with such education as may be a real need to himself and to the community in which he is naturally destined to dwell. Thus every one whose education is assumed by another has a right to a moral education based upon the true grounds of conscientious obligation. In these pages we are not speaking of moral instruction, nor of the groundwork of religion necessary to bring that instruction into voluntary exercise. We are speaking 1, of the elementary school; 2, of the curriculum in the elementary school, apart from instruction in morality and religion, and apart from the question of school management or school discipline. We are looking directly at the matter, and indirectly at the method of secular studies in the elementary school. Is this matter, is the elementary school programme, curriculum, schedule of studies what it ought to be? Is there any criterion by which to judge what it ought to be? Is there any possibility of making it what it ought to be? We naturally look to the end. What does the programme aim at? and what should it aim at? Is there any particular result it ought to have in view? First of all, is there any particular need of individuals and of society for the supplying of which individuals and society have a strict right to look to the programmme? Can the programme, as constructed, supply this need? Does the programme, as conducted, supply this need? And if not, why not? In the purely temporal and social order there is just one such need—both dominant and predominant. It is that the fifteen out of seventeen million students, the fifteen millions who never get beyond the elementary school, be so instructed, developed and trained that when they go forth from the elementary school they may be capable of accepting their natural opportunities in society. By natural opportunities we must understand those which ought to be theirs in view of the social conditions they shall have to face; and which can be made theirs by what it is possible to give them in the limited term of their schooling. Here is something tangible, feasible, a situation which is an ever present reality, a demand for only the most reasonable possibilities.

We have heard some testimony from the inside. It might be asked, what is the impression on the outside. One who should put himself to the task of a fair inquiry would learn this much: that there is a complaint. It is not always very definite in its discrimina-

tion of matters and methods. Still it is a complaint; and it is very widespread. Very often educators are afforded subject for innocent amusement by the character of the grievances which are brought to them, when people demand of the school things which the school cannot be expected to do. However, the complaints that come up from those who have gone out from the elementary school and from their parents may not be all ill-founded. They are not expressed in pedagogical terminology. They are not formulated with a power of analysis and generalization. But, taken all in all, they are expressive of a disappointment which arises when the product of seven or eight years of schooling is set face to face with life in those very surroundings for which his schooling might reasonably have been supposed to be preparing him. The case, as it stands vaguely in the minds of these people, is this: that they have placed implicit confidence in the school, and just at the moment when the situation is beyond repair they find that they have been disappointed. And the reply that is made to them is not always most consoling or reassuring. We challenge them to tell us what do they want; and they are not able to answer us in pedagogical jargon. In this connection we have to notice the two apparently opposite phenomena: universal popular belief in the school, and well night universal popular censure for the school. But the belief transcends the condemnation. There is a firm conviction with the people that it is possible to get a certain something out of the school, and they keep on in the hope that this possibility may be realized. They are like men who are convinced that there is gold in the mine, and who keep on buying stock and paying assessments in the hope that in their day the gold may be forthcoming. So also the people feel they need precisely what they think the school can give them; they see no way of getting this needful thing except through the school; and they hold on to the school.

After taking all the testimony from the parties directly interested on the inside and on the outside, and after collating all that has been said from each exclusive point of view, we shall still find ourselves with a very indefinite case on hand. But there is another view. It is to be had from the standpoint of the well educated man who is not an educator, but upon whom the members of the fifteen million may have to be dependent when they first enter the ranks of the wage-earners. It may be lawful to state how the importance of this view came to be fully recognized by the writer. By reason of special circumstances, during the course of twelve or fourteen years covering precisely this period of chaos and blind experimentation, the writer came to be mixed up outside of the class room with the boys of the fifteen million who had received the elementary schooling and nothing more, and who were to get nothing more. From the char-

acter of his associations with them it soon became evident that one of the most important and most immediately urgent necessary services to be rendered to these boys was to get them something to do. The result was the establishment of a complete bureau of information for their benefit. The writer's connection with these boys was in two large and busy commercial and industrial centres, aggregating at least two million people, or the fortieth part of our total population. The field might be counted a favorable one from which to reckon the average of observation. And the observation was this, namely, that the boys were not fitted by their elementary schooling for actual life. We do not mean by this that they were not sent out consummate financiers and book-keepers and traveling agents and skilled mechanics; but, that they were not possessed of the necessary foundations upon which to build and advance themselves even though they came with the best will and fell upon the best opportunities. What was lacking? Certain definite information and training, essential to their advancement, which could have been provided in the elementary school, but which had been overlooked in the experimentation and crowded out by things not so essential to their future prospects.

And what are these essentials? If the mention of them may seem hardly becoming the dignity of a Quarterly Review, our apology is that they are the prime factors in a very grave social problem. And we have this specific problem very much for the reason that these plain things have been ignored as not being magnificent enough to adorn psychological dissertations on the child, *a priori* rhapsodies on the pedagogic ideal, and cumulative advertising of the *ego*. We are speaking here of the boys. The girls' side of the question might form a problem of itself. We state the question again. We are speaking of a very definite means to a definite end. We are limiting our view to pure instruction in the elementary school, as fitting the boy of the fifteen millions to accept his future opportunities. In the matter of instruction as we have seen the case the essentials are *number* and *expression*. In the manner of imparting this instruction there is one habit which the teacher should continuously aim at forming in the pupil, the habit of *work*.

Of *number* we have this to say, that no good reason can be assigned why an ordinary boy going from the elementary school should not be thoroughly versed in all the common business computations. It is possible for such a boy to arrive at a certain immediate readiness with numbers. Being a possibility it is his right. It is one of the conditions of his future advancement. The boy that has it is both noted and promoted. It shows itself very soon in his conversation with his employer. The boy has the field of number spread out

before him. He has learned the relations of special numbers. He knows his multiplication table; and perhaps he knows it up to twenty-five. He can add off-hand any two numbers under one hundred—and that means any numbers. He has ready answers without being obliged to have recourse in small matters to the artificial processes of the pencil. In short, he can do the better work; and he gets it to do. We may be told, "Let the boys go, later on, to a business school or to a night school." We would not object to their going to these schools. We should like to see them put in six or eight months or a year at these schools. But the boys belong to a class that has quit school and cannot be gotten to go to school. In the business and night schools together we have one-quarter of a million of students. In this other class we have fifteen millions and three-quarters. In fact, we are trying to present the case as mildly as possible; for it is much more desperate than we are making it. We are presuming that all the boys of the fifteen millions finish the seventh and eighth grade. But it would perhaps not be overstepping the mark to say that one-half of them do not enter the sixth grade. Still we are presuming that all pass through the eighth grade in order to present a plea for those at least who get it.

Secondly, *expression*. By this we mean both written and oral expression: language and the use of it, as broadly understood. There it is: number, speech and writing. This looks like prescribing the three R's. But it is something more. For by written expression we do not mean merely legible handwriting, but the power of putting down in writing those things which the boy may have clearly in his own mind. Here again, no legitimate reason can be given why the power of correct expression cannot be acquired in the elementary school. We take the liberty of hinting at one possible result in the line of written expression. The boy can, and to meet his opportunities in the present conditions of society, he should learn everything connected with the writing of a letter: forms of address, subscription, superscription, forms for various occasions, folding, etc. A well digested little book on letter writing would be one of the most valuable books that could be put into the course in the place of something that is not necessary. It would be a treasure which the boy would keep, and which he would often have occasion to consult in after years. There should be nothing connected with notes and letters which the boy might not know. He can learn it all, if it is presented to him, if the teacher knows it—a condition which it not unfrequently wanting. Many and many a time the boy's progress in life will depend upon this one matter, even upon the answering of an invitation, or a note of thanks or a letter of condolence. If a boy comes to me, looking for a place, I give him pen and paper, and tell

him to write his own application. If he cannot do this it may be, of course, because he is exceptionally dull. But if we discover from other circumstances that he is ordinarily bright, then we have to confess humbly that he has not been fairly dealt with: for he might have learned to do it in the time which he has been forced to spend at not learning a dozen other things. He has been systematically defrauded of his opportunities.

Expression embraces also and particularly oral expression and whatever can be put under the heading of self-presentation and address. For instance, there is the study of pronunciation. To teach it properly, the teachers themselves should be skilled orthœpists. How many are? Do we not observe that it is common for a class that has been under a teacher who is well versed in pronunciation, to exhibit an unusual readiness in speech and to be provided with an abundant vocabulary. The reason of this is very simple and natural: the children have become accustomed to the rich vocabulary. They have gathered the true significance of new words from the context as addressed to themselves, and they are not afraid to use them. Nine times out of ten a boy's future will depend upon his address; his address will depend upon his vocabulary; and his vocabulary will be conditioned by his security in pronunciation. One must look out into the broad field of educational influences to see the serious consequences which the presence or absence of the habit of correct spelling and pronunciation has upon the after-life of the pupil. The boy who is not sure of his pronunciation must be hesitant in his speech and limited in his vocabulary through fear of mispronouncing, unless he can have recourse to slang. He who is not sure of his spelling will write few and short letters and will be afraid to attempt those which would be the key to his advancement. And who does not know that readiness in epistolary correspondence and uniformly correct pronunciation, besides being for him his best introduction to a better place and a higher salary, are at the same time amongst the most desirable, the most highly appreciated, and the most serviceable of the polite accomplishments. Given, the boy who is ready with his numbers, who can express himself in complete—not broken—sentences, with a correct pronunciation, who can put on paper, grammatically, his own clear thoughts, and we can always find for him a position from which he can rise.

But there is a *proviso*. And the proviso is that whilst being instructed in the essentials he is also formed to the habit of wholesome labor, such mental labor as the child's constitution will endue and profit by. This labor will not necessarily imply that the boy carries home a stack of books every evening. It will mean more strictly that he tries to carry home *some* knowledge in the evening and to

bring back *some more* in the morning. We speak of a habit of labor. The elementary school that does not look to the formation of this habit is a dangerous thing. It is through repetitions of act that habit is naturally acquired. It is only through the frequent application to actual work that one can acquire the habit of work; and by this we mean the readiness of setting oneself to the accomplishment of a task that cannot be labelled "fun." Moreover, it is only by seeing the results of work that one can learn practically not to look for results until the proportionate work shall have been done. Furthermore, it is in the results of work that we find the stimulus for a new undertaking. Finally, it is from the memories of experience and from the outlook of a wider horizon gained by personal endeavor that one conceives of new enterprises and has the courage to attempt them. There is a grave social danger in a habit of mind which will make a people always on the lookout for their masters to do something for them. The mind which, so to say, has been always surfeited and carried and has not been made self-reliant by the sheer test of its strength against new and growing burdens, is fostered to a most undesirable spirit of tutelage. When the hard problem of life comes so early to the masses—the problem of bread, the problem of a home, the problem of support for the dependent, the problem of caste in society—then the spirit that has not been trained to the habit of work, is in imminent danger of passing to one or another of the extremes, namely, of rebelling against the whole order of society, or of settling down morbidly to life-work as to a slavery, a fatality from which it sees a release only in the grave.

Persons who have been out of the school for twenty years and who have not paid particular attention to the developments that have been going on in the class-room, may well look at us in unbelieving wonder when we tell them of some of the things we are doing or trying to do. Outside of the educators, comparatively few persons have taken in the full significance of a fact which is referred to in the following words (April, 1902) by Mr. William Warner Bishop, of the Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, New York: "At a recent meeting of the Long Island Library Club a question was raised which, it seems to me, is of some concern to students of our educational programmes. The president of the club started a most interesting discussion by asking the assembled librarians if they had discovered any general lack of acquaintance with the order of the letters of the alphabet among children. An almost unanimous affirmative was given, and a series of anecdotes was told to illustrate the very general difficulty experienced, not alone in the use of a card catalogue—which is ever a mystery to some souls—but even in the use of dictionaries and encyclopædias. Moreover—and this is the point which

I wish to bring to the attention of teachers—librarians who have for years been dealing with children, especially those in charge of 'childrens rooms,' affirmed that ignorance of alphabetical order is more noticeable of late than in former years. We have recently heard many and loud complaints that college freshmen can't spell; here comes an affirmative from competent observers that pupils in our grammar and high schools don't know their letters. . . . In view of the immensely important rôle played by the alphabet in most systems and schemes of arrangement, it would be well for those who supervise educational programmes to ask themselves whether they provide in them some place where children are taught thoroughly their A B C'S. . . . Every filing system, dictionary, encyclopædia, catalogue, bibliography, and almost every sort of list has as its basis and key the alphabet. The difficulties to which I am calling attention have been reported in the case of very simple and elementary catalogues, dictionaries, and large-print reference books." We are not called upon here to go into this kind of detail, but we have thought it well to give this single instance in order to put but one question, which will serve as an illustration taken from our practical point of view. What happens to the lad from the elementary school for whom we get a position as office boy, but who does not know habitually the order of the letters in the alphabet? He is soon dismissed. He has things in disorder; or he is so slow that nobody in the office can wait for him. He is not able to follow any classification, whether of goods, towns or customers. Everything is unchangeably committed to the alphabetical order. The business has to move. It cannot wait for the boy. So he is discharged. He has lost his first and his best place, the place where he had a chance to make his record. Now, when he goes place-hunting, his only recommendation will be that he has been discharged as incompetent. Of what avail, then, is it, from this point of view, to have those long essays and lectures on the "scientific, literary and æsthetic correlation of school to life," when the life that is pictured is not the one that the fifteen millions will have to face when they go out from school; when it is the life of culture and ease that will never be theirs unless they afterwards win their way to it; and when they will never be able to win their way to it so long as they are deprived by their education of the possibility of making a start?

Perhaps the man who is acquainted with instruction only is not the best qualified to correlate elementary instruction to life. Dealing always with instructors of ascending and descending grades, he falls instinctively into the (in this case) disadvantage of the man looking through a telescope. He looks through the elementary school into the academy, high school or preparatory college. He

looks through the college into the university; and through the university into the professions. He looks through one tube into another; and right at the start he has the whole surrounding world shut off from view by the walls of his tube. And it is precisely this surrounding world that he ought to take account of; and not the greater or lesser magnitude of those professional stars away off in the depths of the future. He works in the dark; and the darker it is, the better for his work. What he needs to do is to throw away his telescope; to go out into the sunlight; to move with open eyes and open ears amid the seething millions of human beings; to bring with him a mind open to conviction, and a heart open to the sadness of the life of millions, whose life has been made sad because they have been hindered from the possibility of seizing their natural opportunities. In general the people have been told for twelve years, "leave the matter to the experts." They have left it to the experts and—let us confess it humbly—the experts have failed. The people are now told that we must have time; that we must evolve something; that we must study the correlation of the school to life. Does that mean that we must put a new section on our telescope? From the outlook it would seem that the new series of experiments is going to be only a little more disastrous than the old. Men of education to whom our elementary school boys may look for employment, men engaged in banking, railways, industrial and commercial enterprises, in practical philanthropic work, would, were we to consult them, tell us something about the essentials which we might not discover by looking through our telescopes for the rest of the century.

What we are anxious for is simply this, that the fifteen millions be given the chance they ought to have. We have in our power the making of the conditions upon which it will be possible for many of them to rise. Without these conditions it will be impossible—barring the very rare exception—for any of them to rise. We are not affirming that they are all to take the first place; but we do not wish to see them excluded from the tenth and the twentieth place where the opportunities are multiplied by the hundred and the thousand. Concrete education must meet the concrete and inevitable life. Education is a misnomer for the instruction and training that send out a vast population which must necessarily sink until it forms a solid lowest substratum of society; a vast population which before the age of thirty learns that it can never be more than this substratum. The result is a social menace when this population becomes class-conscious of an injury that has been inflicted upon it by those whom it trusted, seeing that if its members had been provided with an essential groundwork upon which to educate themselves, it might have sent up half a dozen men of native intelligence and leader-

ship, of brains and energy, to compete by hard work with every man who came out fortified even with the advantages of a diploma. In our present conditions we find that the boy from the parish or district grammar school, if he has an idea of advancement, finds himself in competition with the boy from the high school and the academy, and even with the college graduate. It is the fifteen millions facing the one million: 15 to 1. The high school or college student says he is willing to take anything to get a start. And he is the one who gets the start. Among the fifteen you may find many who are naturally his intellectual superiors. But he has an immediate preparation which they have not; and they have not the groundwork upon which to prepare themselves for a future opportunity. Thus it comes to pass that the eligible positions fall continuously into the hands of those who need them least; whilst those who need them most are relegated to a class-wage, with little or no hope of ever rising above a precarious Saturday pay-roll. So that whilst we are scorning the class distinction of a titled aristocracy, we are creating, have created a worse money-mind distinction and have furrowed its trench lines deep across our social system.

The character then of the instruction which the boys of the fifteen million need and which they have a right to, is a verydefinite thing. It is so definite, so patent, so single, so universal as a groundwork, that the surprise is how we could have been so successful in shutting our eyes to it. This instruction, too, should be planned in such a way that the boy who leaves school after fifth or sixth grade (as perhaps one-half do) shall be carried as far in essentials as it is possible to carry him by that time. Up to that stage non-essentials should be cut away to the last limit, and thrown back to seventh and eighth grade, if there be time for them even then. If we will not do this, if we will be obstinate in our fantastic theories, if we will insist upon precluding the boy from his chances, we shall have ourselves to blame when we hear his sad refrain, "No use, no use!" and we may put it to our own consciences when we see him settle down doggedly to a daily wage, to do as little as he can for it, and gradually to gravitate until, at the dawn of manhood, he is locked in the embrace of the great discontented. There is, therefore, a grave social problem involved in and dependent upon the working of the elementary school. The problem is how most rapidly to relieve a peculiar strain which cannot be accounted for or remedied by the economist's theories of capital and labor, work and wages, supply and demand. There is question of equalizing this strain by encouraging the expansion of forces inherent in the individual; of restoring a disturbed equlibrium by opening the avenues to a healthy competition on a common ground of essential preparation, where native

intelligence, backed by industry and perseverance may see a chance of winning in the long run from even the holder of a diploma.

W. Poland, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

ANCIENT COMMERCE WITH EAST AFRICA AND THE "OPHIR" OF KING SOLOMON.

WHAT mines supplied the gold for Solomon's Temple? It is curious that the tradition of ages has been silent on this point, and that until recently there have been scarcely more attempts on the part of archæologists to settle the question than to determine the much more shadowy one of the site of the Garden of Eden. It has been known that the carrying trade of the world used to be in the hands of the Phœnicians and Arabs, who brought most of the gold to Jerusalem, while from very remote times there have been rumors of gold-workings in the hinterland, of which Sofala was the port. Throughout a large tract of country, westward of the Sabi river, extensive ruins of well-built stone erections were found, the largest being at Zimbabwe, about twenty degrees latitude south, twelve miles from Fort Victoria. They consist of a combined temple and fortress on a granite hill, and other buildings of elliptic shape on the adjacent plains, with walls from 16 to 35 feet high, enclosing large and small stone towers, and other crumbling ruins in their vicinity. The earliest record of them is 1505 A. D., when the Portuguese traders at Sofala heard of their existence from the Arabs at that port, but no attempt was made to explore them till in 1871 Karl Mauch, a German explorer, discovered them whilst traveling between the Limpopo and Zambesi rivers. In 1891 they were carefully examined by Mr. J. T. Bent, who published the result of his investigations in a book called "The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland;" and recently by R. Hall and W. G. Neal, who published in the present year their results in "The Ancient Ruins of Rhodesia." The hill fortress of Zimbabwe, approached by a narrow, steep ascent, was adorned by monoliths, small round towers and pedestals of steatic rock, some of the latter adorned with carved figures of birds, of the raven, hawk or vulture form, sacred to the gods they symbolized. Here were found fragments of soapstone bowls, with different animals, the human figure and other ornamentations carved upon them. We will give some reasons which seem to show that King Solomon must have obtained most

of his gold from this country, and this view will be confirmed, if we can show that most of the gold of Egypt and Arabia was obtained there many centuries before the era of Solomon.

THE BUILDERS OF THESE TEMPLE-FORTRESSES.

From what country came the builders of these mysterious ruins? According to Mr. Bent, whose opinion is confirmed by Messrs. Hall and Neal, and Professor Keane, "the balance of probabilities seems to be in favor of this country being South Arabia, and when it and Abyssinia are better known, we may find temples which are built of similar small stones, and with similar mathematical peculiarities in their construction. . . . . Some of these buildings, which are known in Yemen, which seem to combine temple and fortress in one, as on Zimbabwe hill, may have been built by the same race that constructed Zimbabwe, and the elliptic temples at Marib and Suivah, and the one at Nakab-al-Hajar, with its north and south doorways seeming to indicate an observation of the meridian, may embody some of the mathematical principles illustrated by the ruins of Mashonaland."[1] Most authorities agree that the builders of these ruins, who worked the gold mines there, were of Arabian origin, probably before the Sabaeo-Himyaritic period, who came into contact with Egypt and Phœnicia, penetrating into countries unknown to the rest of the world. This is confirmed by a comparison with the ancient Egyptian gold mines. "An interesting parallel to the ancient gold-workings of Mashonaland is to be found by studying the account of the ancient gold-workings at the Egyptian gold mines in Wadi Allaga, given us by Diodorus. There, too, the gold was extracted from the quartz by a process of crushing and washing, as we can see depicted in the paintings on the Egyptian tombs, and in any gold-producing quarter of Mashonaland, near old shafts and by the side of streams, innumerable crushing-stones are still to be seen, used anciently for a like purpose, when slave-labor was employed. . . . . From [Diodorus'] account it is obvious that the process employed by the ancient Egyptians for crushing, smelting and forming into ingots was exactly the same as that employed by the ancient inhabitants of Zimbabwe, which fact, together with the vast amount of evidence of ancient cult, ancient construction and ancient art, is, I think, conclusive that the gold fields of Mashonaland formed one at least of the sources from which came the gold of Arabia, and that the forts and towns which ran up the whole length of this gold-producing country were made to protect their men engaged in this industry."[2]

[1] "Ruined Cities of Mashonaland," Chapter V.
[2] "Ruined Cities of Mashonaland," Chap. VI.
[3] Ezekiel, xxvii., 21, 22.

The Bible is full of allusions to the wealth of Arabia in gold and other things. Ezekiel[3] tells us that the Sabaeans were merchants in gold for the markets of Tyre. "Arabia, and all the princes of Cedar, they were the merchants of thy land. The sellers of Saba and Reema, they were thy merchants; with all the best spices, and precious stones, and gold, which they set forth in thy market." According to Aristaeus, a large quantity of spices, gems and gold was brought to Rome not from Arabia, but by the Arabs. All travelers in Arabia say that little or no gold could have come from the Arabian peninsular itself; hence, the Zimbabwe country must almost certainly have been one of the spots whence came the "Thesaurus Arabum." Egyptian monuments also point to the wealth of the people of the Punt; whence did they get the large supply of gold, which they poured into Egypt and the then known world? In Mashonaland we seem to have a direct answer to this question. The Egyptians themselves would appear never to have carried their commerce outside the straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, but to have met at the port of Adule, in the south of the Red Sea, Arabian merchants who did so. Assyrian inscriptions record that, in the time of Solomon at least, Arabian commerce extended as far north as Nineveh, while southward it spread to Egypt, Abyssinia and the east coast of Africa. There is hence little doubt that the builders of Zimbabwe came from Arabia in the unchronicled centuries long before the Christian era.

WHERE WAS THE LAND OF PUNT SITUATED?

A long interval of time must have elapsed between the building of these fortresses and the expedition which Solomon sent to Ophir in quest of gold, 1100 B. C. Before we endeavor to settle the probable locality of Ophir, it will be useful to gather from contemporary records whatever will throw light on Arabian commerce and trade routes during this period. Besides the notices found in the Bible, Egyptian monuments furnish several important references to commerce with East Africa, which seem to confirm the theory that Solomon obtained his gold from Zimbabwe—the place from which gold was generally brought at the time of his expedition. On Egyptian monuments frequent mention is made of *Tanetar*, and *Punt*. Adolph Erman, the great German Egyptologist, says: "With these names they did not connect any very definite meaning; they were general terms, such as commerce introduces, terms like 'the Levant,' etc., with us. *Ta-neter* (the land of the gods) denoted . . . . north and middle Arabia; *Punt* signified the more tropical shores of the Red Sea and the Somali

coast."[4] To settle the position of Punt is important, as Egyptian monuments mention several expeditions which brought back much gold and incense from this land. King Sankhara, of the XI. Dynasty (circ. 2800 B. C.), sent his treasurer, Hena, to Punt. An inscription in the stone quarries of Hammamât tells us: "His majesty sent me to travel by sea to Punt, to bring fresh incense from the princes, the chieftains of the *red land*, for fear drives the barbarians before his face."[5] . . . . The inscription says that he started from Koptos with an army, and many workmen, reached the sea, and went in ships, but of his voyage we know nothing for certain. The *red land* signifies the south coast of Arabia and East Africa, as opposed to the *black land*, or coast of Egypt. Again, Chentchetuêr, the treasurer of King Amenemhê and II., of the XII. dynasty (circ. 2700 B. C.), "returned successfully from Punt—his soldiers were with him, safe and sound, and his ships landed at Sauu."[6] Generally it was by the Arabs that the products of the incense lands were brought to Egypt. Erman tells us: "These products were long ago sold to the Egyptians; incense and myrrh were already in the Old Kingdom the usual requisites of every rite; and one of the natives of the incense-lands, Neger Hert'es'e, was a servant of the son of King Chufu (circ. 3950 B. C.) But nevertheless for many centuries to come the land of Punt seemed to the Egyptian people a half mythical fairyland."[7] At St. Petersburg there is an Egyptian papyrus,[8] of the Middle Kingdom, containing a fairy tale which embodied Egyptian belief in some far-off, mysterious islands beyond the ocean. There one meets with ants, or griffins, who seek gold in deserts, birds collect precious stones into their nests, that hang from beetling cliffs, and even ivory is not got from elephants, but from noble unicorns. Spices and perfumes come from these wonderful islands; there one finds ships at a certain time lying on the shore, guarded by spirits or snakes. The winds are so laden with sweet perfumes that the traveler is well nigh overpowered by their fragrance. Professor Maspéro also tells us: "The story runs that some sailors . . . . had, by going up the river Nile, at last reached the unknown sea that bathed the shores of Punt. . . . . This sea was strewn with mysterious isles, like those enchanted isles which Portuguese and Breton mariners sometimes descried on the horizon, and which faded away as you got nearer. They were peopled by eerie beings, sometimes

[4] "Aegypten" (Ad. Erman), II., p. 667. Also cf. G. Maspéro, "Histoire Ancienne," p. 161.

[5] Lepsius, "Denkmäler," II., 150 a.

[6] Sallier, 203. (British Museum.)

[7] "Aegypten," p. 670, Vol. II.

[8] Discovered in 1880 by M. Golénischeff.

cruel, sometimes friendly, to shipwrecked sailors."[9] In Herodotus (III., 107) we read: "Arabia is the last of inhabited countries towards the south, and is the only land which produces frankincense, myrrh, cassia, cinnamon and ladanum. The trees which bear the frankincense are guarded by winged serpents." . . . . All these products, he tells us, are only gathered with difficulty and some risk, owing to the birds and reptiles which guard them.[10] He bears independent testimony to the Egyptian folk-lore concerning Punt and the incense-lands, which was probably due to popular reports of the voyages of Arab sailors to the east coast of Africa. A few centuries later and this halo of mystery was doomed to disappear; for Queen Hatshepsu caused scenes of the land of Punt to be depicted in her great temple at Deir-el-bahri. She sent a great expedition, about 1600 B. C., to Punt. By this time the Egyptians had carried their victorious arms northwards as far as the Euphrates, and southwards to the Blue Nile, and Egypt was now the middle point between further Asia and East Africa. The scenes depicting this expedition on the walls of the Deir-el-bahri temple represented vessels laden with the precious products of Punt. The inscription runs as follows (cf. Dümichen, Hist. Inschr. II): "They loaded the ships very high with the products of the land of Punt, and all beautiful plants of Ta-neter, and heaps of incense trees, with green myrrh trees, with ebony together with white ivory, with white gold from the land 'Amu, with sweet-scented woods, with incense trees and *mestem* [or *antimony*, with which the Egyptians painted their eyelids], with peacocks, long-tailed monkeys and leopards, with panther skins, with slaves and their children—never was anything like this brought to a king. . . . .

"They bring the queen as presents 'two live panthers which shall follow her majesty; thirty-one green incense trees, which have been brought for the majesty of the god, Amon-Rê. Never has man seen the like since the world has been."

These three inscriptions enable us to settle the geographical position of Punt. It was probably somewhere on the East African coast, as the queen of Punt is depicted as evidently suffering from leprosy; and the shores and islands of the Indian Ocean, especially Madagascar, were then, as now, a nest of leprosy. Compare the products of Punt with those mentioned in the passage already quoted by Herodotus: "Arabia is the last of inhabited countries towards the south, and it is the only country which produces frankincense, . . . cinnamon and laudanum." He does not mean that

[9] "Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient," p. 5. Perhaps these isles were the Socotra group.

[10] The Brit. Encyclopædiæ (art. "Frankincense") remarks that these stories were not improbably due to the fertile imaginations of Arabian spice monopolists.

all these spices *grew* in Arabia,[11] but that Arabia was a mart, or emporium, whence they were distributed to Egypt and other countries; for he adds (c. 111): "Where [cinnamon] grows, and what country produces it they cannot tell—only some, following probability, relate that it comes from the country in which Dionysius was reared;" and this country is Nysa, in Ethiopia, (Hdt. II., c. 146), "beyond Egypt." He says further on (III., c. 114): "Where the south declines towards the setting sun lies the country called Ethiopia, the last inhabited land in that direction. There gold is obtained in great plenty, huge elephants abound, with wild trees of all sorts, and ebony." Though the term "Ethiopia" used by the historian is not to be regarded as used with strict geographical accuracy, it would roughly correspond with South Abyssinia and Somaliland, since its products, mentioned by Herodotus, resemble those of the latter country.

Again, all the products of Punt (except peacocks) mentioned in the inscription of Queen Hatshepsu are native to Somaliland, but only the less important ones to Arabia. In the latter country there are no elephants, or ivory, very few incense trees, and of gold not a trace. But in Somaliland "gum, myrrh, frankincense[12] and aloe . . . appear in great profusion, zebras appear in large herds, the giraffe, rhinoceros and hippopotamus, gazelles and antelopes, lions and leopards, ostriches are found all over this country."[13] Some of these animals must have been quite new to the Egyptians, so that the inscription would truly say: "Never has man seen the like since the world began."

It is very probable, therefore, that the "Punt" mentioned in the Deir-el-bahri inscriptions is the modern Somaliland, and this view is generally accepted by modern Egyptologists. The British Encyclopædia (s. v. Phœnicia) tells us: "In the Arabian caravan trade in perfumes, spices and incense for worship the Phœnicians had a lively interest (Hdt. III., c. 107). These wares were mainly produced in eastern Africa and India; but Sheba in Yemen was the emporium of the whole trade. . . . In Egypt Phœnician trade and civilization soon took firm root." The Arabs in their commerce were thus helped by their Phœnician kinsmen. "It is doubtless for this reason," says Professor Maspéro,[14] "that the national name of

---

[11] He says *frankincense* was cultivated in Arabia, cinnamon in Ethiopia; he does not say explicitly where the rest grew.

[12] The chief varieties of incense trees of Somaliland are: *Cinnamon zeylanicum* (Hebr. Kinnamon), Frankincense (Hebr. Lebanon) *(Boswellia Thereana, B. Bhau-Dajiana, Boswellia Carterii)*, myrrh (Heb. môr) the gum resin of *Balsamodendron Myrrha*. *Pterocarpus Draco*, the "dragon's blood" of commerce, native to Socotra.

[13] "Africa" (Keith-Johnston), p. 282.

[14] "Histoire Ancienne," p. 161.

one of their tribes, *Punt*, Poeni, Puni, was applied by the Egyptians to Arabia and the Somali coast."

But where did the people of Punt obtain the gold which they gave to the Egyptians? The only gold mines in the northeast of Africa were those of the Egyptians at Koptos, and Wadi Allaga, in Nubia, as Sir G. Wilkinson has proved, but the people of Punt cannot have obtained their gold from either of these places. Moreover, these two mines could not have yielded the vast quantity of gold recorded on Egyptian monuments, apart from what the people of Punt possessed.[15] The inscription of Queen Hatshepsu, however, calls it "white gold *from the land 'Amu*," *i. e.*, it was not obtained from mines in Punt. From a picture at Beni-Hassan on the tomb of Khnumhotep, a local governor of Usertesen II., of the XI. dynasty, we learn that the 'Amu were a Semitic race, perhaps from north Arabia. "The term 'Amu," says Dr. Fritz Hommel, "which was applied *in the earliest times* to the whole of the Beduîn and semi-Beduîn races of the adjacent Semitic countries, is probably derived from the javelin, or boomerang, which was their favorite weapon; the Egyptians *afterwards* extended the term to all Asiatics, including the Hittites."[16] Hence it is called "white gold from the land 'Amu," since it was probably brought to them *by Arab merchants*, perhaps from their emporium of Yemen.

MENTION OF PUNT IN SCRIPTURES.

Again, the "Punt" of Egyptian monuments is now generally identified with the "Phut" of the Old Testament, Gen. x., 6: "Filii autem Cham; Cush, et Mizraim, et Phut et Chanaan." Kush, or Kash, in Egyptian times, represented the region south of the first cataract, and corresponded to the Ethiopia of classical geographers, while it betrayed the Mesopotamian origin of the early Egyptian people. Mizrain, a dual form of expression, is the name by which Egypt was known to the Semites, called in the cuneiform inscriptions Musur, (Masr), *i. e.*, the "borderland." Chanaan is the tract of country between Mount Hermon and the delta of the Nile.[17] The

---

[15] We can form some notion of how much gold and precious stones the ancient Egyptians possessed not only from the hieroglyphic inscriptions, but also from the jewelry disinterred from the tombs, from time to time, by Mr. de Morgan and other explorers. In 1894, for example, near the pyramids of Dashur, he found two crowns of delicately-worked gold and other gems, which had belonged to princesses of the twelfth dynasty, and which he valued at £70,000. When we notice the preponderence of gold over silver or any other metal, we need not be surprised at the gold and precious stones used in Solomon's temple, seeing that such materials were abundant many centuries before Moses lived. Cf. "History of Egypt," by Professor Flinders Petrie, etc.

[16] "Ancient Hebrew Tradition" (Hommel, 1897), p. 47.

[17] "Recent Archæology and the Bible" (Nicol, 1898), p. 126.

fact that three of the sons of Ham occupied contiguous territory in the northeast of Africa, from Mount Hermon to about latitude 12 degrees north., warrants us in concluding that the land of Phut likewise adjoined them, and therefore would correspond with Somaliland. The geography of these places is very complicated, because it was different at different periods, and differently represented by outsiders than by natives. Again, in Jerem. xlvi., 9, Kush and Phut are mentioned together, and in Ezech. xxvii., 10, Phut is mentioned, which is translated by "Libyes" in the Vulgate. A river Phut in Africa is alluded to by Ptolemæus IV., i., 3, and Pliny v., 13. It is hence probable that Phut refers to the Hamite people, who dwelt in the country south of modern Abyssinia, or the "Punt" of Egyptian monuments. Jeremias (xlvi., 9) had predicted the invasion of Egypt by the Babylonian King, Nabuchodonosor. "That he actually invaded Egypt we now know from a fragment of his annals. In his thirty-seventh year (567 B. C.) he marched into Egypt, defeating the Pharaoh Ahmes, and the soldiers of '*Phut* of the Ionians, . . . a distant land which is in the midst of the sea.' "[18] The latter were now probably allies of Egypt; but these references to Phut seem to confirm our view as to its position with regard to Egypt.

EAST AFRICA KNOWN TO THE ARABS AND EGYPTIANS (CIRC. 1800 B. C.)

We have discussed the position of Punt, and Egyptian commerce with it, at some length, since the products of Punt and Ophir are very similar, and probably came from the same country, as we shall try to prove. It may be objected that the Arab traders had never been so far south as Sofala or Zanzibar, and that the frail ships of antiquity, of which few were larger than a Thames sailing barge, could not have traversed that enormous distance amid uncharted rocks and shoals. We have proof, however, that East Africa was known even to the Egyptians during the XVIII. dynasty (1600 B. C.); in the record of the conquests of Tuthmoses III. (who lived two reigns after Queen Hatshepsu), on the northern wall of the temple of Karnak. Under this dynasty Egypt reached her palmiest days, and of the kings who led Egypt to conquests she had never dreamed of before, Tuthmoses III. was the most renowned (1503-1449 B. C). From the Euphrates to the Egyptian Soudan he held undisputed sway. His "Song of Triumph"[19] was

[18] "The Egypt of the Hebrews" (Prof. Sayce), p. 130. Cf. P. Knabenbauer, S. J., in Nahum, iii., 9.

[19] "We have [in it] a business-like account of his campaigns, much of it copied from the memoranda of the scribes who accompanied the army on its march." Prof. Sayce ("The Egypt of the Hebrews.")

engraved on the walls of Kamak. Among the countries subdued occurs the name Pat, an unknown locality, but Wilkinson says that this name, as indicated by the vulture's foot, was probably a Totem, and that it points to some very primitive tribe of equatorial Africa. Again, there is mention of the "circuit of the great waters," which, according to Marriette and Lenormant, perhaps refer to the equatorial lakes. Nor is this incredible, since Tuthmoses' name and inscriptions have been found as far west as Scherschell, in Algeria; and quite recently, even in Mashonaland, ushabti figures have been found from the time of Tuthmoses. Moreover, this Pharaoh kept a war fleet in the Red Sea. Among the stations visited by it, mentioned in the geographical lists of Karnak, was Ras Hafun, in Somaliland, so that Punt and the east coast was now no longer the half-mythical fairyland of yore, but a vassal State of Egypt, their tribute to Tuthmoses III. being ivory, ebony, apes and other Southern products. Therefore the Arabs must have been familiar with the east coast of Africa, and the gold of Punt was probably brought by them from Sofala, as they coasted along Africa to their great emporium, Yemen. The distance was roughly three thousand miles, yet the trade winds and monsoons were of great importance to them, which they used with great experience; and navigation was certainly highly developed. Herodotus says that the Pharaoh Neco II. (611 B. C.) sent ships from Suez, with Phœnician crews, to circumnavigate Africa. This fact, though sometimes questioned, is accepted as historically true by Professor Sayce, Maspéro and many Egyptologists. Professor Maspêro says: "This enterprise, bold at any time, was most dangerous for the small ships of the period; they had always to sail within sight of land, and the coasts of Africa make navigation difficult. For several months the Phœnicians went southwards, keeping the African shore on their right hand. Towards autumn they landed at the nearest point, planted some corn seed and waited till the grain was ripe; after reaping it, they resumed their voyage. The exact record of their observations and discoveries was soon lost: they only remembered that on reaching a certain place they saw to their amazement the sun rising *on their right hand*. They had doubled the southern cape of Africa, and began to sail northwards. In the third year they passed the Straits of Gibraltar and came into port again."[20] The east coast must have been one of their regular trade routes, as the names of many places along it are Arabic, *e. g.*, Sofala, Suaheli, (seashore), etc. Again, Mr. K. Johnstone says: "*From very early times* Phœnician and Arab merchants were in the habit of visiting Madagascar, and formed colonies on the northwestern

[20] "Histoire Ancienne," p. 537. "Egypt of the Hebrews," Sayce, p. 125.

coast."[21] Hence the distances were not too great for the ships of those times, especially as many of the voyages were along the coast, and even nowadays Arab dhows traverse the same routes as the ships of their ancient ancestors, laden with incense, spices, ivory and other such wares (v., note 32). We will sum up briefly the conclusions we have so far arrived at: (1) The Arabs and Phœnicians must have got an immense amount of gold from Zimbabwe. This is certain. One estimate puts the value of gold thus extracted at £75.000,000. (2) The people of Punt got their gold from the Arab merchants. (3) Punt was the modern Somali coast and the opposite littoral of Arabia; its people were of Hanite origin. ("Africa," K. Johnstone.) (4) The gold ingots were brought to Punt by the Arab sailors, as they coasted northwards along Africa to Yemen, which was an Arab trade route from time immemorial. (5) The first recorded expedition to Punt of the Egyptians occurred during the eleventh dynasty (circ. 2800 B. C.)

These conclusions, which are highly probable, not only confirm the identity of Sofala with Ophir, as we shall see presently, but also that the east coast of Africa was continuously under the influence of Arabian traders, and that the mines of Zimbabwe were worked as early as the eleventh Egyptian dynasty.

SOLOMON'S EXPEDITION TO THE LAND OF OPHIR.

The building of the temple of Jerusalem is described in III. Kings v. Solomon wished to provide gold for its adornment, to pay his workmen and to fill his treasury; III. Kings ix., 27: "And King Solomon built a fleet also at Ezion-Geber, which is near Ailath on the shore of the Red Sea in Idumaea. And Hiram sent in that fleet his servants, sailors that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon." Solomon possessed neither ships nor sailors. Now, the Phœnicians were the incontestable masters of the whole Mediterranean, but they did not possess a single port on the Red Sea, or Persian Gulf, and so they could only receive the rich products of Arabia and India by caravans. It was therefore their interest to go and seek them for themselves, in the country which produced them, by allying themselves with Solomon. Ezion-Geber was on the eastern arm of the Red Sea what Suez has in our days become on the western. Thence the fleet set out for Ophir, its destination. Where was Ophir, or at least, whence came the gold of King Solomon? The chief opinions, and the only ones which deserve our attention, are those which place this country in Africa, in Arabia and in India respectively. The Scripture says: "And

[21] "Africa" (Johnstone), p. 516.

they came to Ophir, and they brought thence to King Solomon four hundred and twenty talents of gold." (III. Kings ix., 28.)

1. It is improbable that Ophir was in South Arabia, although Professor Keane in his recent work places Ophir there, and makes Zimbabwe, whence the gold was obtained, the "Tarshish" of the Bible. Solomon would not have built large ships at great expense to carry back through the Red Sea merchandize, that from time immemorial had been conveyed overland through Arabia by caravans, nor would the voyage have taken three years, as the text (III. Kings x., 22) denotes. Solomon built the ships to get the gold and incense trees in the country which produced them.

2. The partisans of the Indian source of Solomon's gold have a much stronger case, and include Professor Max Müller, Pere Vigouroux, etc. What were the wares brought back in Solomon's ships? They went to Tarshish and Ophir, but we are here only discussing from what country the wares were got, and not trying to identify those wares with any modern places.

But the fleet of Hiram, which brought the gold from Ophir, brought from Ophir great plenty of thyine trees and precious stones. . . . Never were such thyine trees as these brought, or seen unto this day—III. Kings x., 11, 12.	But the servants of Hiram . . . brought gold from Ophir, and thyine trees (valgu, ————), and precious stones. . . . Never were there seen in the land of Juda such trees.—II. Paralipomenon ix., 10, 11.

"For the Tarshish ships of the King used to go by sea with Hiram's ships every three years, the Tarshish ships bringing back gold, and silver, and ivory, and apes, and peacocks."—III. Kings x., 22.

The last text has been translated literally from the Hebrew; the Vulgate, the Septuagint and the Arabic versions make the writer say that Solomon's ships went every three years *to Tarshish*, reading *al* instead of *ani* before the second Tarshish. Professor Keane follows this reading, and says that Ophir was not a district, but the Arabian port to which the treasure was brought from Tarshish, and that *Tarshish* was probably Sofala. According to our interpretation, a "ship of Tarshish" means a big cargo vessel (navis eneraria), such as generally went to Tharsis, in Spain, just as we might speak of an "East Indiaman," or an "Atlantic liner." The repetition of a noun is not uncommon in the Old Testament, eg. in Psalm cxii., 8; Ps. cxxi., 4, 5; Ps. cxxxii., 2, etc. St. Jerome was told by his informant, a Jew, that Tarshish meant simply "high sea."

Wherever Tarshish may be, we are here only enquiring *from what country* Solomon got the gold and wares mentioned in the above

texts. We see that the wares obtained from Punt, and from Ophir (or Tarshish) are very similar.

FROM PUNT.	FROM OPHIR.
gold (from the 'Amu)	gold
silver	silver
ivory	ivory
long-tailed monkeys	apes (gôf)
peacocks	peacocks (tôkei)
incense-trees[22]	wood of thyine trees (valgu)
panthers, etc.	precious stones.
Never was anything like this brought to a king. . . . Never has man seen the like since the world began.—(Inscription in temple at Deir-el-Bahri.)	There were no such thyine trees as these brought, nor seen unto this day.—III. Kings x., 12; II. Paral. ix., 11.

The chief arguments in favor of the view that Ophir was in India are: 1. The words for peacocks and incense woods are of Malabar origin. 2. Most of the above-mentioned products are found in India. 3. Many writers in the early Christian speak of Ophir as being in India.

Professor Max Müller says: "The words used to signify apes, peacocks, ivory, and algum wood are in Hebrew foreign words, just as *gutta-percha* and *tobacco* are foreign words in French. . . . If we can find a language to which these words belong, we shall be right in concluding that the country, where this language was spoken, was the Ophir of the Bible."[23] The words for apes, peacocks, incense wood (gôf, tukki, algum) are foreign words in Hebrew. Almug, or algum is usually identified with sandal wood, which grows in Malabar and Malay (valgum); it seems to be a foreign word also in Sanskirt. *Tukki* corresponds to *tôkei* in the Tamoul or Malabar language. Now in II. Paralip. ii., 8, we read of "algum from Lebanon" (V. *pinea* de Libano), but sandal wood did not grow on Mount Lebanon, so that here "algum" must mean some other kind of incense wood. Perhaps the word was used to denote the *new species* of incense trees brought to Solomon, hitherto unknown to the Hebrews, and mistaken for one of the many sorts of sandal wood brought from India (chandana, etc.). Again, if it does mean sandal wood, one species is known in Zanzibar, and another near the river Manombolo, in Madagascar, which island the Arabs used to visit from the earliest times. Possibly, as Professor Keane suggests, the peacocks and sandal wood were got at Dhafâr in South Arabia, but at all events that "algum" means sandal wood here, must be considered at least doubtful. Again, peacocks are native to

[22] The ordinary word for incense in the Vulgate is *"thus,"* sometimes *"libanus."* Classical Latin has but one word, *"tus."*

[23] Max Müller, "Lessons on the Science of Language."

India, but they were introduced into Egypt and Libya by the Arabs, at a very early period, and so could have been obtained on the east African coast by Solomon's ships. Maspéro says: "It is quite possible that instead of going in quest of these objects in India itself, Solomon's sailors found them in one of the numerous depôts on the coast of Africa, which had dealings with India from remote antiquity."[24] Possibly the Arab sailors went with the trade-winds to India, and thence with the trade-winds to Zanzibar, and then back along the coast to Yemen, so that really a voyage to Sofala was a voyage to India and further on. This theory would explain satisfactorily how the peacocks and sandal wood might have been got directly from India.

Peacocks are mentioned in Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions, which shows that the Egyptians were acquainted with them from the earliest times, e. g., the well-known "Hymn to Rê" (god of the sun). Erman says: "When the morning sun steps forth in the east, in the land of the gods [North Arabia], and dispels the darkness, then all living things rejoice, and before all, according to the Egyptian belief, are the peacocks, who raise their claws in prayer to the kindly stars; 'Honour to thee, O Rê at sunrise, Atum at sunset! . . . The *peacocks* worship him, and all wild animals together praise him.' "[25]

Moreover, peacocks, as we saw, were brought to Queen Hatshepsu from the land of Punt, in 1600 B. C.—so they were known *in Africa* 500 years before Solomon's expedition to Ophir (1100 B. C.). A peacock was stamped on the money of the Phoenician colony of Leptis Minor, and was sacred in the eyes of the Libyans.

Again, the apes are called gof in the Hebrew; they correspond to the *Kaf* (Sanskrit Kapi) on Egyptian monuments, being there depicted as cynocephalous apes (e. g., in Queen Hatshepsu's inscriptions). The Septuagint uses the same word that Plato uses in his "Theatitetos" to describe them; hence they are the species found in Somaliland and South Arabia.

Ivory, too, was abundant on the east African coast, and was common in Egypt from the earliest times, e. g., in the Louvre there is an ivory box, inscribed with the name of the Egyptian King, Neferar-ka-Ra, of the Fifth Dynasty—nearly 3,500 years B. C. In the time of Tuthmoses III., to mention a single instance, tribute was paid to Egypt by the vanquished Rotennu (Syrians) in the shape of ivory, both carved and unwrought.

Again, silver, which is always found where gold abounds, forms

[24] "Histoire Ancienne," p. 335, note. Professor Keane suggests Dhafâr in S. Arabia.

[25] "Aegypten," Vol. II., p. 522.

part of the mineral wealth of Rhodesia. Among the Egyptians silver was the costliest metal, because the rarest; all the more ancient inscriptions mention it before gold, and in the tombs silver ornaments are much rarer than golden ones. Probably the amount brought to Solomon was very small, for in III. Kings x., 21 we read: "All the vessels were of gold: and all the furniture was of most pure gold: there was no silver, nor was any account made of it in the days of Solomon."

As for precious stones, the early Egyptians were rich in them, and Ethiopia yielded the topaz (Job xxviii., 19), syenite, malachite, lapis lazuli and granite; also cornelian, serpentine, carbuncle and sapphire,[26] though *some* of these were found in India.

Thus all the wares brought to Solomon could have been obtained in Africa, viz., at Sofala and the Suaheli coast.

Lastly, the references to Ophir in the writers of the early centuries after Christ, seem to identify it with India. Thus Josephus tells us: "He [Solomon] bade them sail to the country formerly called Ophir, but now the land of gold, which is part of India." St. Jerome, translating Job xxviii., 16: "[Wisdom] is not compared with the gold of Ophir," renders it: "Non conferetur tinctis *Indiae* coloribus;" in "De Locis Hebraicis" he says that Ophir is a region of India.

Also Gusebius in his "Onomasticon," and Procopius, in his "Comment in Isaiam" say the same thing. These passages might seem to prove the identity of Ophir with India, but we must remember that Josephus and the writers of the early centuries had only the vaguest notion of countries south of Arabia.[27] "The southern parts of the Red Sea," says M. Letronne, "often received, even in the historical and geographical works of the ancients, the name of *India*, or the epithet, *Indian*."[28] A vestige of this survives to-day in the name, "Indian Ocean," which washes the very shores of Natal and the Suaheli coast. Not improbably the Arab traders purposely concealed all knowledge of these places from the nations, Egypt, Palestine, etc., to whom they brought their merchandize, just as the Phoenicians kept secret the whereabouts of the Cassiterides,[29] or Tin Islands of S. Britain to avoid the competition of possible rivals. Strabo (bk. 3 ad fin.) relates that a Phoenician captain, when chased by a Roman, steered upon a shoal, and caused the wreck of his own

[26] Hummelauer, S. J. (Comment in Exod. xxvii., 17, sq.).

[27] Maspéro says, "Capthor, nom vague qui, comme *Tharsis* et *Ophir*, n'offrait aux Hebreux d'autre idée que celle d'un pays maritime et lointain."

[28] Recueil des Inscriptions, t. II. (1848), p. 37.

[29] Thus Herodotus (who often recounts popular legends as historical) would not believe these two *facts;* "I do not allow that there is any river, Eridanus . . . nor do I know of any islands, whence the tin comes which we use" (iii., 115).

and his pursuer's ship, rather than betray the secret of the tin mines in Britain.

When the navigation of the Egyptians was in its infancy, the Arabs doubtless encouraged the folk-lore we spoke of—of treasure islands guarded by mystic Genii—in order to conceal the source of their fabulous wealth, and thus to keep the monopoly of the carrying trade of the Indian Ocean, just as the Phoenicians had that of the Mediterranean.

Ophir certainly corresponds with the Sanscrit âbhîra, the name of a country and its people. The name implies some shifting of a nationality, and has been forgotten later on. We cannot hence identify Ophir with Abhîra, at the mouth of the Indus, especially as the products of distinctly Indian origin (peacocks and valgum) come from *Southern* India, and would have first been brought to Abhîra, as to a dêpot, like the frankincense, which Arrian relates was an *import* of Barbariké on the Sinthus (Indus),[30] from Somaliland.

Again, the testimony of all travelers and prospectors is that India could never have furnished the amount of gold brought to ancient Arabia and Palestine. There are traces of ancient gold mines in Mysore, but there is no evidence to show that they were worked by Arabs or Phenicians. As for precious stones, "despite its *legendary wealth*, which is really due to the accumulation of ages, India cannot be said to be naturally rich in precious stones."[31] In fact, when St. Jerome[32] speaks of the gems in India and ("Montesque aurei,") *mountains of gold*, he is only repeating the traditional stories about India, the *locus classicus* in those days for great wealth (v. note 30), and not quoting any serious historian, or geographical writer. Thus Milton[33] says: "High on a throne of royal state, which far

> Outshone the wealth of Ormuz or of Ind,
> Or where the gorgeous east, with richest hand,
> Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold. . . .

In fact, since Africa was practically unknown till the nineteenth century, the wealth of the East has always been attributed to India. The products brought from Ophir (with the exception of the peacocks) were not abundant in India. But when we have evidence, that in the time of the early Egyptian dynasties the Arabs brought those products from East Africa to their emporium of Sheba in Yemen, that the Egyptians from the earliest times were rich in gold and incense, that they obtained from Punt (Somaliland), the same wares that Solomon obtained 500 years later from Ophir (gold, in-

[30] Encycl. Brit. (s. v. Frankincense). About 9,000 cwt. is still annually shipped in Arab dhows to Bombay.

[31] Ibid (s. v. India). Precious stones are found rather in Ceylon and Burma.

[32] Ep. ad Rusticum, xcv.

[33] "Par. Lost," II., 1.

cense trees, etc.)—products so new that in both cases "never had such things been seen before," it is very probable that they came from the same country, viz., Sofala, and the East African coast; and such a conclusion would fully explain the existence of the mysterious ruins in Rhodesia.

Among those Semitic tribes, there was a community of religious ceremonies and ideas, which took the form of a gross deification of the forces of nature. The archaic monuments left by them in parts of Arabia are similar to those of Zimbabwe, elliptic temples and stone towers symbolic of the primitive cult. The wealth of gold among the Sabaeans was shown by the overland journey of their queen to Solomon's court, when she took with her, besides spices and precious stones, no less than 120 talents of gold, nearly equal to one-third the amount (420 talents) brought home by the Tyro-Israelitish fleet from Ophir. That the gold-producing region of Ophir was the "red land" of East Africa, now known as Mashona-land, where the river Sabi flows, there can be little doubt. A century ago Bruce fixed upon this country as the only locality corresponding to Ophir, which could have furnished the quantity of gold supplied to Arabia in remote times; and he proved by the law of the monsoons that the return journey of Solomon's fleet Ezion-Geber to Sofala, would exactly occupy the three years assigned to it. The Greek author of the "Periplous of the Erythraean Sea," (210 B. C.) tells us that the east coast of Africa was then in the possession of Kharibel, King of the Himyarite-Sabaeans "through ancient right;" and the Egyptian fleets sent out by the merchants of Alexandria found the vessels trading there had Arabian commanders, acquainted with the country, who could speak their language.

We have not mentioned any of the archæological finds at Zimbabwe. They only confirm our conclusions respecting the country, from which the builders came, but do not throw any light upon the ancient names of these places, nor the period at which they were built. "To clinch the matter one of two things is needed; either the decipherment in the Yemen Himyaritic inscriptions of place-names, that can be identified with East Africa sites—not an easy problem; or the discovery of Mimparitic inscriptions in Rhodesia. Surely the people who chiseled so many documents in their own land cannot have lost the epigraphic art in voyaging to the Zambesi. . . . The first object of all future excavations in Rhodesia should be the discovery of such evidence."[34] Much therefore remains to be done in the way of excavation, before the mystery of these ruins which are dotted about over an area of 100,000 square miles, is fully

[34] *Athenæum*, March 29, 1902. Cf. the Athenæum, April 5, 1902, "Dr. Peters knows of two such 'Himyaritic inscriptions' in the Inyanga district."

solved. The remains of forty of the ancient inhabitants have been found, buried with bangles of gold. The largest quantity thus found with a single skeleton was not less than 72 oz. (£288), and the average was as high as 17 oz. (£68). Perhaps some buried inscription may be brought to light in the near future, like the Rosetta Stone, which will give the key to the enigma of the date, builders, and history of these wonderful monuments of prehistoric ages.

Thus the gold fields of Rhodesia, which were "discovered" a few years ago by the pioneers of the "Chartered Company," were known to the Arab merchants probably 2,000 years before Christ, and are only another instance of the truth of King Solomon's words: "Nothing under the sun is new, neither is any man able to say: Behold this is new: for it hath already gone before in the ages that were before us." (Eccles. i., 10, 11.)

J. D. Murphy, S. J.

St. Bueno's College, St. Asaph, N. Wales.

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.

VIGILANTIAE studiique memores, quo *depositum fidei* Nos quidem longe ante alios sartum tectumque praestare pro officio debemus, litteras encyclicas *Providentissimus Deus* anno MDCCCXCIII. dedimus, quibus complura de studiis Scripturae sacrae data opera complectebamur. Postulabat enim excellens rei magnitudo atque utilitas, ut istarum disciplinarum rationibus optime, quoad esset in potestate Nostra, consuleremus, praesertim cum horum temporum eruditio progrediens quaestionibus quotidie novis, aliquandoque etiam temerariis, aditum ianuamque patefaciat. Itaque universitatem catholicorum, maxime qui sacri essent ordinis, commonefecimus quae cuiusque pro facultate sua partes in hac caussa forent; accurateque persequuti sumus qua ratione et via haec ipsa studia provehi congruenter temporibus oporteret. Neque in irritum huiusmodi documenta Nostra cecidere. Iucunda memoratu sunt quae subinde sacrorum Antistites aliique praestantes doctrina viri magno numero obsequii sui testimonia deferre ad Nos maturaverint; cum et earum rerum, quas perscripseramus, opportunitatem gravitatemque efferrent, et diligenter se mandata effecturos confirmarent. Nec minus grate ea recordamur, quae in hoc genere catholici homines re deinceps praestitere, excitata passim horum

studiorum alacritate.—Verumtamen insidere vel potius ingravescere caussas videmus easdem, quamobrem eas Nos Litteras dandas censuimus. Necesse est igitur illa ipsa iam impensius urgeri praescripta: id quod Venerabilium Fratrum Episcoporum diligentiae etiam atque etiam volumus commendatum.

Sed quo facilius uberiusque res e sententia eveniat, novum quoddam auctoritatis Nostrae subsidium nunc addere decrevimus. Etenim cum divinos hodie explicare tuerique Libros, ut oportet, in tanta scientiae varietate tamque multiplici errorum forma, maius quiddam sit, quam ut id catholici interpretes recte efficere usquequaque possint singuli, expedit communia ipsorum adiuvari studia ac temperari auspicio ductuque Sedis Apostolicae. Id autem commode videmur posse consequi si, quo providentiae genere in aliis promovendis disciplinis usi sumus, eodem in hac, de qua sermo nunc est, utamur. His de caussis placet, certum quoddam Consilium sive, uti loquuntur, *Commissionem* gravium virorum institui: qui eam sibi habeant provinciam, omni ope curare et efficere, ut divina eloquia et exquisitiorem illam, quam tempora postulant, tractationem passim apud nostros inveniant, et incolumia sint non modo a quovis errorum afflatu, sed etiam ab omni opinionum temeritate. Huius Consilii praecipuam sedem esse addecet Romae, sub ipsis oculis Pontificis maximi: ut quae Urbs magistra et custos est christianae sapientiae, ex eadem in universum christianae reipublicae corpus sana et incorrupta huius quoque tam necessariae doctrinae praeceptio influat. Viri autem ex quibus id Consilium coalescet, ut suo muneri, gravi in primis et honestissimo, cumulate satisfaciant, haec proprie habebunt suae navitati proposita.

Primum omnium probe perspecto qui sint in his disciplinis hodie ingeniorum cursus, nihil ducant instituto suo alienum, quod recentiorum industria repererit novi: quin imo excubent animo, si quid dies afferat utile in exegesim Biblicam, ut id sine mora assumant communemque in usum scribendo convertant. Quamobrem ii multum operae in excolenda philologia doctrinisque finitimis, earumque persequendis progressionibus collocent. Cum enim inde fere consueverit Scripturarum oppugnatio existere, inde etiam nobis quaerenda sunt arma, ne veritatis impar sit cum errore concertatio.—Similiter danda est opera, ut minori in pretio ne sit apud nos, quam apud externos, linguarum veterum orientalium scientia, aut codicum maxime primigeniorum peritia: magna enim in his studiis est utriusque opportunitas facultatis.

Deinde quod spectat ad Scripturarum auctoritatem integre asserendam, in eo quidem acrem curam diligentiamque adhibeant. Idque praesertim laborandum ipsis est, ut nequando inter catholicos invalescat illa sentiendi agendique ratio, sane non probanda, qua scilicet plus nimio tribuitur heterodoxorum sententiis, perinde quasi germana Scripturae intelligentia ab externae eruditionis apparatu

sit in primis quaerenda. Neque enim cuiquam catholico illa possunt esse dubia, quae fusius alias Ipsi revocavimus: Deum non privato doctorum iudicio permisisse Scripturas, sed magisterio Ecclesiae interpretandas tradidisse; "in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, eum pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendum esse, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari;" eam esse divinorum naturam Librorum, ut ad religiosam illam, qua involvuntur, obscuritatem illustrandam subinde non valeant hermeneuticae leges, verum dux et magistra divinitus data opus sit, Ecclesia; demum legitimum divinae Scripturae sensum extra Ecclesiam neutiquam reperiri, neque ab eis tradi posse qui magisterium ipsius auctoritatemque repudiaverint.—Ergo viris qui de Consilio fuerint, curandum sedulo, ut horum diligentior quotidie sit custodia principiorum: adducanturque persuadendo, si qui forte heterodoxos admirantur praeter modum, ut magistram studiosius observent audiantque Ecclesiam. Quamquam usu quidem venit catholico interpreti, ut aliquid ex alienis auctoribus, maxime in re critica, capiat adiumenti: sed cautione opus ac delectu est. Artis criticae disciplinam, quippe percipiendae penitus hagiographorum sententiae perutilem, Nobis vehementer probantibus, nostri excolant. Hanc ipsam facultatem, adhibita loco ope heterodoxorum, Nobis non repugnantibus, iidem exacuant. Videant tamen ne ex hac consuetudine intemperantiam iudicii imbibant: siquidem in hanc saepe recidit artificium illud criticae, ut aiunt, sublimioris; cuius periculosam temeritatem plus semel Ipsi denuntiavimus.

Tertio loco, in eam studiorum horum partem quae proprie est de exponendis Scripturis, cum latissime fidelium utilitati pateat, singulares quasdam curas Consilium insumat. Ac de iis quidem testimoniis, quorum sensus aut per sacros auctores aut per Ecclesiam authentice declaratus sit, vix attinet dicere, convincendum esse, eam interpretationem solam ad sanae hermeneuticae leges posse probari. Sunt autem non pauca, de quibus cum nulla extiterit adhuc certa et definita expositio Ecclesiae, liceat privatis doctoribus eam, quam quisque probarit, sequi tuerique sententiam: quibus tamen in locis cognitum est analogiam fidei catholicamque doctrinam servari tamquam normam oportere. Iamvero in hoc genere magnopere providendum est, ut ne acrior disputandi contentio transgrediatur mutuae caritatis terminos; neve inter disputandum ipsae revelatae veritates divinaeque traditiones vocari in disceptationem videantur. Nisi enim salva consensione animorum collocatisque in tuto principiis, non licebit ex variis multorum studiis magnos expectare huius dis-

ciplinae progressus.—Quare hoc etiam in mandatis Consilio sit, praecipuas inter doctores catholicos rite et pro dignitate moderari quaestiones; ad easque finiendas qua lumen iudicii sui, qua pondus auctoritatis afferre. Atque hinc illud etiam consequetur commodi, ut maturitas offeratur Apostolicae Sedi declarandi quid a catholicis inviolate tenendum, quid investigationi altiori reservandum, quid singulorum iudicio relinquendum sit.

Quod igitur christianae veritati conservandae bene vertat, studiis Scripturae sanctae promovendis ad eas leges, quae supra statutae sunt, Consilium sive *Commissionem* in hac alma Urbe per has litteras instituimus. Id autem Consilium constare volumus ex aliquot S. R. E. Cardinalibus auctoritate Nostra deligendis: iisque in communionem studiorum laborumque mens est adiungere cum Consultorum officio ac nomine, ut in sacris urbanis Consiliis mos est, claros nonnullos, alios ex alia gente, viros quorum a doctrina sacra, praesertim biblica, sit commendatio. Consilii autem erit et statis conventibus habendis, et scriptis vel in dies certos vel pro re nata vulgandis, et si rogatum sententiam fuerit, respondendo consulentibus, denique omnibus modis, horum studiorum, quae dicta sunt, tuitioni et incremento prodesse. Quaecumque vero res consultae communiter fuerint, de iis rebus referri ad Summum Pontificem volumus; per illum autem ex Consultoribus referri, cui Pontifex ut sit ab actis Consilii mandaverit.—Atque ut communibus iuvandis laboribus supellex opportuna suppetat, iam nunc certam Bibliothecae Nostrae Vaticanae ei rei addicimus partem; ibique digerendam mox curabimus codicum voluminumque de re Biblica collectam ex omni aetate copiam, quae Consilii viris in promptu sit. In quorum instructum ornatumque praesidiorum valde optandum est locupletiores catholici Nobis suppetias veniant vel utilibus mittendis libris; atque ita peropportuno genere officii Deo, Scripturarum Auctori, itemque Ecclesiae navare operam velint.

Ceterum confidimus fore, ut his coeptis Nostris, utpote quae christianae fidei incolumitatem sempiternamque animarum salutem recta spectent, divina benignitas abunde faveat; eiusque munere, Apostolicae Sedis in hac re praescriptionibus catholici, qui sacris Litteris sunt dediti, cum absoluto numeris omnibus obsequio respondeant.

Quae vero in hac caussa statuere ac decernere visum est, ea omnia et singula uti statuta et decreta sunt, ita rata et firma esse ac manere volumus et iubemus; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub anulo Piscatoris die XXX. Octobris anno MDCCCCII., Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo quinto.

A. Card. Macchi.

APOSTOLIC LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER LEO XIII.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

On the Institution of a Commission for Biblical Studies.

Leo XIII. Pope in Eternal Memory.

FAITHFUL to the tradition of watchfulness and zeal by which we, first of all, because of our office, are bound to preserve the deposit of Faith safe and inviolate, we gave to the world in the year 1893, the Encyclical *Providentissimus*. In it we included, after due examination, a number of questions concerning the study of Holy Scripture. The grandeur and extreme utility of the subject impelled us, in effect, to determine, as far as in us lay, the directive principle of those studies so necessary now that the increase of erudition confronts us every day with the consideration of novel questions which are sometimes in danger of being treated in a manner fraught with rashness.

Wherefore, we have warned all Catholics and especially those in holy orders, of the work which each one should undertake in this matter in accordance with the abilities with which he is endowed, and we applied ourselves with the greatest care to show how and in what manner, these studies should be developed in conformity with the needs of our epoch. This document has not been without result, and it is with joy that we recall the testimonies of submission which the Bishops and a great number of men eminent in science hastened to give us while proclaiming at the same time the opportuneness and the importance of what we had written; and promising to conform with the greatest diligence to our instructions. Another remembrance no less agreeable comes to us in the fact that excellent beginnings were immediately made by some in the direction indicated, and an enthusiasm awakened in various places in the prosecution of such studies. Nevertheless we remark that the causes which prompted us to publish the previous letter are still persistent and more serious. It is therefore necessary to insist more emphatically on what has already been enjoined and more than ever to express our desire that our Venerable Brethren of the episcopate should watch with the greatest vigilance over these studies. To ensure greater facility as well as fruitfulness, we have resolved to add new strength to our authority in this matter. As the task now before us of explaining these divine books and maintaining them intact is too difficult for our Catholic interpreters to acquit themselves well of,

if left to their individual efforts, and because the work is nevertheless so necessary on account of the manifold developments of science and the appearance of such multitudinous error, it is deemed proper that a federation of energies should be made, and that assistance should be afforded under the auspices and direction of the Apostolic See. This result, it appears to us, can be easily attained if we make use in the present instance of the means which we have already employed for advancing other studies.

Wherefore it has seemed good to us to institute a council or, as it is termed, a Commission of men of learning whose duty shall be to effect that in every possible manner the divine text will find here and from every quarter the most thorough interpretation which is demanded by our times, and be shielded not only from every breath of error but also from every temerarious opinion. It is proper that the principal seat of this Commission should be in Rome, under the very eyes of the Sovereign Pontiff. As it is the seat of the mistress and guardian of Christian knowledge it should also be the centre from which there should flow through the whole body of the Christian commonwealth the pure and incorruptible teaching of this science which is now so indispensable. The men of whom this Commission shall be composed and who to satisfy fully the serious obligation which is laid upon them and which confers on them such distinction, should regard as peculiarly and especially their own the tasks which are here proposed to their zeal.

In the first place, having established exactly what is the actual intellectual trend of the present day with regard to this science, they should bear in mind that none of the recent discoveries which the human mind has made, is foreign to the purpose of their work. On the contrary, let them make haste in any case where our times have discovered something useful in the matter of biblical exegesis, to avail themselves of it forthwith and by their writings to put it at the service of all.

Wherefore they should devote themselves with the greatest care to the study of philology and kindred sciences and keep themselves abreast of the progress of the day. As it is generally on this point that the attacks on Holy Scripture are made, it is there that we should likewise gather our arms of defense; so that there may be no inequality in the struggle between truth and error. Likewise they shall take measures that the knowledge of the ancient and oriental languages, and above all the art of deciphering the ancient texts should be assiduously cultivated. In our contest with unbelievers, both of these kinds of studies are, as a matter of fact, a precious help in biblical studies.

In what concerns the integral safeguarding of the authority of the

Scriptures, the members of the Commission will employ an active vigilance and unremitting assiduity. The main point to be attained is that Catholics should not admit the malignant principle of granting more than is due to the opinion of heterodox writers, and of thinking that the true understanding of the Scriptures should be sought first of all in the researches which the erudition of unbelievers has arrived at. Indeed, no Catholic can consider as subject to doubt these truths which we have elsewhere referred to at greater length, and they must know that God has not delivered the Scriptures to the private judgment of the learned, but has confided the interpretation of them to the teaching of the Church. In the matter of faith and morals which pertain to the teaching of Christian Doctrine, the sense of Holy Scripture, which must be considered as the true sense, is that which has been adopted and is adopted by our holy Mother, the Church, whose office it is to judge of the real meaning and interpretation of Holy Scriptures. It is therefore not permitted to any one to interpret the Holy Scripture in any way contrary to this sense, or even in any way contrary to the universal opinion of the Fathers. As we were saying, the nature of the divine books is such that in order to dissipate the religious obscurity with which they are shrouded we must never count on the laws of hermeneutics, but must address ourselves to the Church which has been given by God to mankind as a guide and mistress. In brief, the legitimate sense of the divine Scriptures ought not to be found outside the Church nor be pronounced by those who have repudiated its teaching and authority.

The men who are to compose this Commission should therefore watch with great care to safeguard these principles and to keep them, as time goes on, with still greater strictness. And if certain minds profess an exaggerated admiration for heterodox writers, they must be led by persuasion to follow and to obey more faithfully the direction of the Church.

Doubtless there may arise an occasion when the Catholic interpreter may find some assistance in authors outside of the Church, especially in matters of criticism, but here there is need of prudence and discernment. Let our doctors cultivate with care the science of criticism, for it is of great utility in order to grasp in its complete sense the opinion of hagiographers; and in that they will receive our warmest approbation. Let them draw from this science new resources by availing themselves even of the assistance of non-Catholic scholars. In doing so they need not fear our disapprobation. They should however be careful not to draw from habitual association with such writers independence of judgment, for in point of fact the system which is known in our days as higher criticism frequently

leads to such results. Its dangerous rashness we have more than once already condemned.

In the third place, it is of importance that this Commission should consecrate its most special attention to that part of these studies which properly concerns the explanation of the Scriptures and which opens to the faithful a great source of spiritual profit. In whatever touches the texts whose sense has been fixed in an authentic manner, either by the sacred writers or by the Church, the Commission, it is needless to say should be convinced that only that interpretation can be adopted. Such is the rule of sound hermeneutics. But there exist numerous passages upon which the Church has not yet given any fixed or precise definition with regard to which it is permitted to each doctor in his individual capacity to profess and to sustain the opinion which seems to him to be correct. They must know, however, that on these points they should keep as the rules of interpretation the analogy of faith and of Catholic doctrine. Moreover, we must be on our guard in this matter against transgressing, in the excessive ardor of debate, the limits of mutual charity. It is also of importance not to seem to discuss revealed truths and divine traditions. If they make light of intellectual concord, and if these principles are not safeguarded, we cannot have any right to expect that the divergent labors of such a great number of scholars will accomplish any notable progress in this science.

Hence this Commission will have as its task to regulate in a legitimate and suitable manner the principal questions which are pending between Catholic doctors in order to arrive at a conclusion. To settle them the assembly will lend sometimes the light of its judgment, sometimes the weight of its authority. Their investigations will also have a result of the greatest advantage, namely, that of furnishing to the Holy See an opportune occasion to declare what ought to be inviolably maintained by Catholics, what ought to be reserved for more profound research and what ought to be left to the free judgment of each.

Having therefore in view to ensure the maintenance of Catholic authority in its integrity, and to promote the studies which relate to Holy Scripture in conformity with the rules which have been herein laid down, we, by these present Letters, establish in this illustrious city, a council or a special Commission. We wish it to be composed of some Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church who shall be chosen in virtue of our authority. It is our intention to add to them with the functions and titles of consultors, and to take part in the same studies and the same labors, as it is customary in the sacred Roman Commissions, certain eminent men who belong to different nationalities, who are recommended by their knowledge in sacred studies, and above all, in whatever appertains to biblical science.

The Commission will hold its fixed reunions and publish its writings, which will appear periodically or as need may require. If advice is asked of it, it will reply to those who consult it. In a word, it will labor by all means in its power to maintain and to develop the studies of which we speak. We desire that a report concerning all the questions which may be treated in common, should be addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff by the Consultor, to whom the Commission will have confided the office of Secretary.

In order to furnish members of the Commission with available help, which will be of service to them in any of these studies, we herewith assign to them for this purpose a certain portion of our Vatican Library. We shall take care that a numerous collection of manuscripts and volumes of every epoch which treat of Biblical questions shall without delay be classified and placed at the disposition of the Commissioners. It is very desirable that well-to-do Catholics should come to our assistance to establish and enlarge this library in sending to us resources to be employed for this end, or useful books, and in so doing they will render a service in a most fitting manner to Almighty God, who is the Author of Scriptures and of the Church.

Moreover, we have confidence that Divine Providence will amply bless this undertaking, which has for its direct object the safeguarding of Christian faith and the eternal salvation of souls, and that Catholics who are devoted to the Holy Books will respond with an absolute and complete submission to the declarations of the Holy See on this point. We wish and we ordain that all and every one of these prescriptions and decisions which it has seemed good to us to make and to formulate on this point shall be and shall remain ratified and confirmed in the manner which we have adopted and formulated any clause to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given in Rome at St. Peter's, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 30th of October, the year 1902, Twenty-fifth of our Pontificate.

To Cardinal Macchi.

Scientific Chronicle.

LIQUID FUEL IN PRACTICE.

In our last Chronicle we spoke of the use of liquid fuel in locomotives and stationary engines, we have now to record its practical application for marine purposes. The Oceanic Steamship Company has lately fitted out the single-screw iron steamer "Mariposa" with new engines and a plant for the burning of liquid fuel only. The Bureau of Steam Engineering which is investigating the question of liquid fuel for use in the United States Navy gives the report of Commander H. N. Stevenson who witnessed the trial trips of the "Mariposa" and of Lieutenant Ward P. Winchell who represented the Department on the round trip made by the vessel between San Francisco and Tahiti.

The oil is atomized as explained in our last article but by a special process and the air is heated before mingling with the oil-vapor. Some facts gathered from the observation of the way in which the heating apparatus behaved and from the results obtained will give an idea of its success and promise.

The first trial trip was not satisfactory. This was due to the fact that the installment for the burning of the oil was not complete. The boilers primed badly because the construction dirt had not been removed, the oil burners clogged with dirty oil for no strainer had been fitted, the tell-tale device to indicate the height of the oil in the service tank and the controlling device for the oil pump were also wanting. This trip was intended rather to gain some experience and acquaint the force in the fire-room with the use of the apparatus for oil firing. No attempt was made to measure the amount of oil burned nor to attain a maximum speed, so this trip furnished no data, except the study of the working of the oil apparatus.

One accident that occurred during the trial served to bring out one advantageous feature of the oil burner for generating steam. The oil in the small heating tank overflowed and choked the burners. By means of a lever the valves in the air and oil pipes were shut. The atomizer tubes where the oil had caked were unscrewed and clean ones put in their places. During the time that it took to make the change, which was fifteen minutes for all, very little steam pressure was lost and the vessel kept on her way with but little decrease in speed. The value of being able to shut off the oil and air quickly and clean the atomizers or replace them by new ones is a decided

advantage. The closing of the valves by a lever permits the adjustment of the air and oil supply to remain and the fire can at once be started with perfect adjustment if at the time of shut down it was satisfactory.

For the second trial trip the oil strainer and the regulating device for the heater tank were completed. On this trip the oil apparatus worked well and was handled with great ease and uniformity and the smoke resulting from the combustion was scarcely noticeable for an hour at a time. An average speed of 14 and ¼ knots per hour was maintained. The steam pressure was maintained at any desired point uniformly and without difficulty.

On the round trip to Tahiti better results were obtained although there were some drawbacks which experience shows can be overcome. The principal difficulties encountered were in regulating the supply of oil to the heaters by means of the pump. This was due to the fact that an automatic submerged float intended to control the throttle of the pump did not work well, and the supply of oil was regulated by hand. There was trouble also with the oil strainers. They became clogged with dirt and allowed no oil to pass. This difficulty can be obviated by arranging the strainers in pairs so that a clean one can be switched in while the choked one is cleaning.

The furnaces had not been cleaned after the trial trips and on arriving at Tahiti this work was attended to. The tubes were swept, the back connections, uptakes, ash pans and furnaces were cleaned and the refuse taken from all these places barely filled two ash buckets. As a result it has been determined to sweep the tubes only after the round trip of twenty-four days steaming. Only ordinary precautions were taken to guard against fire or explosion. All the spaces to which oil has access are well ventilated by inlet and outlet ducts. The oil used is from the Kern river district, California, and is a thick dark liquid resembling molasses, but it gives off volatile gases that form explosive mixtures with air, still it is handled with the same ease as if it were so much coal.

This same vessel as coal burner had a force of thirty-six men in the engine and boiler rooms but as an oil burner this force is reduced by nineteen. This in itself shows a great saving in running expenses. Full power was not developed in the two boilers used, as schedule time was easily exceeded, with from two to four of the burners shut off.

From the expert testimony of the value of oil in this case and in others the following advantages of oil over coal as a source of heat for naval purposes may be summarized. Its use does away with the production of heavy smoke that reveals to the enemy the whereabouts of the vessel. A sudden call for more steam can be promptly

and effectively met. The greater effectiveness of the furnace must also be considered as well as the great relief to the stokers on account of the ease of firing. When coal is burned recourse is had to a forced draft to accelerate the combustion. The effect of the forced draft is to produce the maximum intensity of heat at the back part of the furnace. This is injurious to the boilers and increases the amount of heat wasted in the uptake. With liquid fuel the most intense combustion can be maintained and controlled in the front part of the furnace, thus securing a better utilization of the heat and guarding against serious injury to the boilers.

Yet with all these advantages it is still doubtful whether the Bureau of Steam Engineering will recommend the adoption of liquid fuel for the navy. It is true that at present there are serious difficulties in the way. The principal ones are those which while they are not insurmountable, are sufficiently formidable to delay recommendation of this method of heating on any large scale for naval purposes until such time as fuller tests can be made under the actual conditions in which it is to be used in the navy, which conditions are quite different from those of the merchant marine. It is likely then that tests will be made on some of our torpedo boats and destroyers. The main difficulties arise from cost and supply and the structural difficulties that must be overcome in properly storing the oil in our large battleships.

With regard to the difficulty of cost and supply while it may be less than that of coal for vessels of the merchant marine that travel between fixed ports where there is a sufficient supply of oil, still the same is not true of naval vessels that must be ready to steam at any time to any port within their steaming radius. To keep an adequate supply of oil for such purposes would become a military problem involving a complete chain of fuel stations between country and colony. The present cost of transportation of oil is far in excess of that of coal. This is partly due to the difficulties encountered in the construction of the oil tank steamers and the consequent expense, which will no doubt be reduced when there is an increased demand for oil. Still this high cost must be taken into account in any present installation for oil fuel.

The adapting the battle ship as a carrier of oil fuel may be much more difficult. The deck of the ship must be a clear gun-platform and hence the oil will have to be stored in the double bottoms of such vessels. This makes the problem of ventilation difficult and increases the danger of explosion from the heavy gases that are given off from the oil and which when mixed with air might be very easily exploded by a spark from the numerous electric wires and appliances found on board these vessels.

Further study, however, of the problem is to be made and even if it does not result in the universal adoption of oil for all the vessels of the navy, it will bring to light much useful information which will be of value where oil fuel is practicable.

COMMERCIAL OXYGEN.

Oxygen has many uses especially in metallurgical operations and hence the prospect of its manufacture on a commercial scale is of great interest. Professor von Linde has lately suggested its commercial production through the agency of liquid air. If the process meets with success it gives a practical application to liquid air. The critical temperature of the air or the point at which it liquefies at the atmospheric pressure is about 191 degrees centigrade. The principal constituents of the liquid air are oxygen and nitrogen and they have different boiling points. Nitrogen evaporates at 195.5 degrees, but oxygen does not boil until the temperature has been raised to 182.5 degrees. On account of this difference of 13 degrees it is possible to separate the nitrogen from the oxygen, thus obtaining a supply of liquid oxygen. Since in liquid air there is, in every five parts only one of oxygen to four of nitrogen, four-fifths of the liquid must be evaporated at the lower temperature in order to leave liquid oxygen behind. When about 60 per cent. of the liquid air is evaporated the residue contains equal parts of oxygen and nitrogen. To liquefy one cubic metre of air requires two horse power and of this quantity only one-fifth is oxygen. This shows that if oxygen is to be obtained in this way on a commercial scale some cheaper method of manufacturing liquid air must be devised. Hence the query, where does the greater part of this two horse power go? It is used principally in reducing the temperature. Hence if the temperature could be reduced a smaller amount of energy would be required to liquefy the air. Just here do we find the value of the method suggested by Professor von Linde. He utilizes the cooling effect of the evaporating nitrogen to reduce the temperature of a new quantity of air so that a smaller expenditure of new energy is required to liquefy it. That this effect is reached by the evaporating nitrogen is evident, for in reducing it to the liquid condition a large quantity of heat was abstracted from it. To return it again to the gaseous condition an equal amount of heat is required and if when it is returning, it be mechanically arranged that the change occur near a quantity of air, the heat will be taken from the air and its temperature thus reduced. The Linde Ice Machine Company are

using such a process at Munich. Some of their results give us data for calculating the cost. A mixture of equal parts of oxygen and nitrogen, an oxygen sufficiently pure for most practical purposes, can be made at the rate of 100 cubic metres per hour by the expenditure of 100 horse power of energy. To obtain pure oxygen a greater expenditure is required; but it is stated that it can be produced at the rate of half a cubic metre per hour per horse power. As the cost of power varies with different localities and the different sources employed, the cost of the oxygen will vary, but can be easily calculated.

To this method must be added that of M. George F. Jaubert. In his investigations he sought a method whereby oxygen might be produced in a way similar to that in which acetylene gas is produced from calcium carbide. If calcium carbide is put into water the acetylene gas is given off. The oxygen problem then was to find a substance that put into water would give off oxygen in good quantities and at a rate that could be controlled. Such a substance is the peroxide of sodium, or the peroxide of potassium. These substances are formed by heating the metal sodium or the metal potassium in a current of oxygen when they absorb the gas in varying proportions. When they are put into water they are decomposed and give off the gas in a very pure condition. M. Jaubert has found a cheap way of manufacturing these substances and a plant for that purpose has been established. The peroxides are furnished as small 1½ inch cubes or as pellets ½ inch in diameter. They are used in a gas generator just as the carbide is used and the oxygen given off is regulated and collected. The peroxide is promised at a price as low as 10 cents per pound. One pound of it will furnish between 75 and 125 litres of oxygen. The gas made in this way should have a large use in artificial respiration, in diving apparatus and in submarine boats.

UTILIZATION OF CITY REFUSE.

In our last Chronicle we described the treatment of city sewage. It may be of interest to know that the solid refuse which, for sanitary reasons, is collected in the cities of the civilized world, is generally utilized for industrial purposes. Formerly this refuse was accumulated and then disposed of by burning or used as a filler whereby waste lands were reclaimed. Food wastes are usually collected separately and utilized for special purposes to which we shall refer. All other solid refuse is subjected to a rough assortment. Bones,

glass, rags, iron, paper and the like are separately collected and sold for reutilization in the branches of industry of which they were original products or as factors in new industries. Old tin cans are ordinarily used for one of three purposes; first for the recovery of the tin that is in them, secondly for the recovery of the solder along their seams and thirdly for smelting purposes in the manufacture of steel and iron. The inflammable refuse is consumed in furnaces and the steam generated utilized in operating engines for purposes of electric lighting and power. Lord Playfair in an article in the North American Review states that the city of Glasgow obtains from such waste heat equal to nearly 9,000 horse power per day of ten hours and this heat is used for manufacturing purposes.

Food wastes are profitably used by what is known as the Arnold utilization process. This process consists in digesting the waste in steam digesters where it is separated into greases and a residue used in fertilizers. These greases are nearly all shipped abroad where they are refined and graded as glycerin, red oil, lard oil and poorer grades. The secret of treating garbage grease seems to be held abroad, for little or none of it is held for treatment in this country. The treatment of the garbage requires about eight hours and during this time it is subjected in the digesters to the action of steam at a pressure varying from forty to eighty pounds. The vapors of the cooking are not allowed to escape but are condensed. After the cooking the contents of the digesters are discharged into tanks from which it goes to presses where the grease and water are separated from the solids. The solids are put through screens where metals, bones and pieces of crockery are separated from the fertilizer proper which is then dried and bagged for shipment. The liquids are run into tanks where by gravity the oil and water are separated. Here the grease is skimmed off and barrelled for shipment. This is another illustration of the way in which science turns to useful purposes what was so long regarded as useless.

D. T. O'Sullivan, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

MUSIC IN THE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH. By *Edward Dickinson.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902.

Professor Dickinson, whose admirable articles in the *Quarterly* aroused more than a passing comment, and which we are glad to find incorporated in this volume, has given us under the above title a work worthy of the highest commendation. It will be found of valuable service to the student of church history as well as music, and, we might add, the liturgy. The work, free from all pedantry and speculative hypotheses, shows a deep, honest, painstaking study of almost all available sources, a keen appreciation of the inner life of the Church and a trustworthy knowledge of its doctrine, symbolism and liturgy. Above all, it has the proper grasp of a subject much misunderstood—the function of music as the handmaid of religion, its relative and anciliar association with the liturgy. It handles the subject, a stumbling block to most Protestant historians, with such lucidity, sympathy and accuracy—is so intuitionally in touch and harmony with the true teaching, practice and spirit of the Church—that one can hardly dispel the illusion that the writer is not to the Catholic manor born.

There are few or no indications in the volume of 421 pages that would lead to the inference that the Professor is not the accredited lecturer in some Catholic theological seminary, instead of being the Professor of the History of Music, in the Conservatory of Music, Oberlin College. Oberlin can take pride in its chair of music. The knowledge of every Catholic student or priest cannot fail but be enriched, his love for true church music quickened, the beauty of the liturgy more fully revealed, higher ideals implanted by coming in contact with such a work.

It is not a mere haphazard compilation, which most of our histories of music are; nor is it a detailed narrative of dry and dull data which usually form the pabulum of commercial hackwriters; nor does it show reverence or fear in striking at some of the "consecrated falsehoods" of centuries. It shows deep research, originality of presentation, a judicious use of a vast bibliography and, above all, a fearless intrepidity in publishing the results of honest, critical investigation. Few writers, for instance, would state in public print, even if we mistake not in the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* the fact which almost every conscientious student of the history of music long since knew that "Luther composed no

[hymn] tunes. Under patient investigation of a half century, the melodies originally associated with Luther's hymns have all been traced to their sources" (p. 259). That even Luther's battle song, "Eine feste Burg," on which so much maudlin sentimentality has been lavished, from Heine to Carlyle in literature, from Mendellsohn to Wagner in music, proves to be nothing more than an adaptation from an old Mass. In the face of Bäumker's riddling criticism of the legend, we still have Naumann and his Anglican editor Ouseley try and prop up the decrepit and discredited fiction. Nor does he hesitate to assail the equally unhistorical myth about Palestrina being the "Saviour of Church Music," because his Missa Papae Marcelli disarmed all opposition and criticism—which still circulates in Catholic books.

Where in English Catholic literature can we secure a more thorough, sympathetic study of music in its relation to the Primitive Church and its liturgy than we do here under the captions, "Ritual and Song in the Early Christian Church" and the "Liturgy of the Catholic Church"? If Ambros' great history were accessible to the English reader, we might have a more scholarly and exhaustive treatment—one entering into every detail of the liturgical chant—but it could hardly be more accurate and sympathetic than this condensed form. Few Catholic writers on music rise to a more intelligent apprehension, discern the inherent appropriateness, the devotional fervor and withal the artistic attributes and adaptability of Gregorian Chant to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. How one can read the chapter on "The Ritual Chant of the Catholic Church," which has elicited the unstinted admiration of almost every great musician from Mozart to Wagner, without feeling a sense of deprivation, in view of the inane trash that greets us Sunday after Sunday, is hard to explain. Again, where, outside of a few scattered monographs or essays, usually in German or French, do we find such a clear, illuminative study of "The Modern Musical Mass" than on page 182?

The work will be a valuable accession to the library of every student who wishes to know and understand the true musical treasure trove of the Catholic Church. Its use as a text book in some of our seminaries would be productive of a vast amount of good.

A few inadvertencies do not materially detract from the solid worth or critical trustworthiness of the book. Thus, the expression "adoration of the Virgin Mother" (p. 231) may convey a wrong meaning to the unintelligent or cursory reader. The great Benedictine monastery at Beuron, Germany, and the Paulist Fathers, New York, deserve a mention for cultivating the Gregorian Chant to the exclusion of all other kinds of music. The Beuron School of Gre-

gorian Music is probably without a rival. The addition of Wackernagel's epoch-making work on the German *Kirchenlied,* as well as Gerbert's *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica,* would contribute materially to the excellent bibliography given. H. G. G.

A-T-ON INTÉRÊT À S'EMPARER DU POUVOIR? Par *Edmond Demolins.* Firmin-Didot, 56 Rue Jacob, Paris. Pp. 338. Price, 3½ francs.

The name Edmond Demolins is likely to be associated in the reader's mind with a book that won for itself a universal interest some few years ago, entitled the Superiority of the Anglo-Saxons—*A quoi tient la Superiorité des Anglo-Saxons*—a book which within its brief life has passed into English, German, Spanish, Polish and Arabian. Other works from the same author have found a wide circle of admirers, notably *The Frenchmen of To-day* and *The New Education.* The latter book sets forth the author's ideas and program of education of boys which he has practically embodied in the *Ecole des Roches*—a school located at Verneuil near Paris. The latest book by M. Demolins may be said to furnish the natural and necessary conclusion to the first of the works just mentioned. The burden of both is the proof of the thesis that "the Yankee and the Englishman are to-day the freest men that now exist and that ever have existed and that "they owe their undeniable superiority to the extraordinary power of private life and the narrow limitations of public life" (p. 139). It does not fall within the lines of the present review to discuss the author's claims for American Anglo-Saxon superiority amongst the nations. Aside, however, from this portion of his arguments in support of what he regards as the cause of the alleged superiority are strong and are cleverly handled. Deduced from ancient and modern history they throw a multiplied illumination on the central idea that the greed for political power saps the vigor and life of individuals and of peoples. The author shows in a striking if not entirely novel fashion this to have been the cause of the ancient Greek and Roman decadence and in modern times of the Spanish; and he points to the same cause as hastening unmistakeably the decline of his own country, France. On the other hand, he indicates how the development of private initiative, the growth of the virile qualities of the individual as such, has created the superiority of societies both ancient and modern. Liberty he shows is better guarded by private initiative than by universal suffrage. The development of political powers means war; the development of individuality means peace. The most effectual means for a man to become superior is for him to place himself in the

necessity of undertaking an enterprise that depends on himself alone, that can succeed only by his personal effort and by long perseverance. In other words, it is the necessity of conquering by self-reliance that tempers character, fortifies the will and assures success. Now this necessity, says M. Demolins, manifests itself very differently according as public life predominates over private, or vice versa. In the first case, in societies with large public powers, the controlling thought of every one is to make a living at the public expense, to install himself comfortably in some of the countless sinecures of the huge administrative organism. Personal energy, individual initiative are lessened, and more and more atrophied, because reliance is placed on the group, on the great public body, instead of on individual force. Rapidly then does the race decline and collapse. On the other hand, in societies with restricted powers the individual has no resource from those assured and tranquil positions and is forced by circumstances to create for himself the means of existence through his own endeavor and labor. Thus personal energy, individual initiative, are stimulated to their maximum, and rapidly the race develops and rises above others.

The author illustrates this line of argument by the examples on the one side of the French Jew and Protestant and on the other side by that of Poland and Ireland and Catholic France of the present day. M. Demolins is, so far as we can detect, a Catholic and writes as such. He contends that the material prosperity attained by the French Jew and Protestant is not at all dependent on their religious tenets, no more than the material decadence of Catholics in France of to-day results from their faith. In the one case the force of circumstances necessitated private initiative, which lead on to national success, in the other case reliance on political power occasioned decline of personal effort and consequent national decay. Evidently these illustrations open out a wide field for discussion, upon which we cannot enter here. Making due allowance for the author's somewhat excessive admiration for the English speaking nations, we must admit his dominant opinion as regards at least one of the causes of material prosperity amongst those nations, the play and development of individual initiative. How the working of this cause is to be controlled so as not to result in the production of a race of consummate egoists, self seeking money instead of political power grabbers is of course the problem. M. Demolins' closing chapter throws some light on the question. He argues strongly in favor of developing the money making but at the same time the money spending faculty. Money, he says, is an element of individual moralization and of social progress, but only under two imperative conditions. A man should be able to make money hon-

estly and painfully, and should know how to spend it usefully and generously. To gain money painfully develops energy and endurance, makes a man love obstacles and habituates him to master them. To spend money usefully and largely elevates and ennobles the soul. Money thus becomes not an end but a means—a means to ameliorate human conditions and create institutions of public beneficence by which present and future generations may profit. The ideal here presented, though not lofty, is certainly within easy apprehension, if not within as easy realization. How the just equilibrium between egoism and altruism which it inculcates is to be obtained M. Demolins does not, so far as we have noticed, explicitly state. Doubtless he would say that it is just here that religion must exert its influence. In this as in many of his opinions and arguments we readily agree with him.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1803.

The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland O., announce in a limited edition, an extensive, and unusually important literary undertaking—an historical series entitled "The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803: Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and Their Peoples, Their History, and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the political, economic, commercial, and religious conditions of those islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the nineteenth century," in fifty-five volumes, the first of which will appear about January 15, 1903. This work will present (mainly in English translation) the most important printed works, to the year 1803, including a great number of heretofore unpublished MSS., which have been gathered from various foreign archives and libraries, principally from Spain, Portugal, France, England, Italy, Mexico, Japan, the Philippines, etc. The manuscripts which have been known to a very few scholars only, and have been very difficult heretofore to study, are of great importance at the present time.

The series will be edited and annotated by Miss Emma Helen Blair, A. M., of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, assistant editor of *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, and James Alexander Robertson, Ph. B., also formerly engaged upon that work. An historical introduction and notes are furnished by Edward Gaylord Bourne, professor of history in Yale University, well known as an authority on early Spanish discoveries and colonization in the New World. The series will include a very careful and extensive

bibliography of Philippina—the most valuable that has yet appeared. There will also be an exhaustive, analytical index to the complete series.

The selection of documents to be published in this series has been made with special reference to the social and economic conditions of the islands under the Spanish régime, and to the history of the missions conducted therein by great religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church. The undertaking is commended by well known scholars, librarians, and ecclesiastics, and promises to be one of the most important literary events of this decade. The work will contain many illustrations of historical importance from Spanish and other originals, from manuscripts, etc. It will further be illustrated with modern and old maps, plans of cities, views, convents, architecture, etc. It will give for the first time in the English language the complete, original sources of our knowledge of these islands for over three centuries, and will thereby make accessible to scholars for the first time the books and manuscripts to which we must refer to get a clear and correct view of the social, economical, political, and religious state and history of the islands. Many important and almost unknown manuscripts now published for the first time will throw much new light on present conditions and on the inner history. The sources and authorities in every case will be carefully given, and the locations of rare Philippina in libraries at home and abroad will always be stated. The text will be carefully elucidated by notes, geographic, historical, ethnological, etc., and many contributions by well known scholars and specialists will be included.

This work is of great value and interest at the present time when a correct knowledge of the islands is absolutely necessary, and it will contain much of interest to students of Geography, Ethnology, Linguistics, Folklore, Comparative Religion, Ecclesiastic History, Administration, etc. The economic and commercial aspects will be given due attention, and it is the intention of the editors to make the work such that it will be highly welcome to librarians who are already seriously embarrassed in trying to meet the demand, in both reference and public libraries, for information relative to our Malaysian possessions—a demand which is increasing rapidly and must continue to increase.

A Dictionary of the Bible. Dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D. Vol. IV. Pleroma-Zuzim. Royal 8vo., pp. 994. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This volume completes the Dictionary proper as announced, but another is to be added containing indexes and certain subsidiary matter that is considered important. Now that the book has been

completed it is not inappropriate to recall the scope of the work as outlined in the beginning. It was thus stated:

"It is an encyclopædic dictionary of the Old and New Testaments, together with the Old Testament apocrypha, according to the authorized and revised English versions. It is believed that in no other similar work can the student or reader obtain such scope and fulness, such absolute accuracy and authoritativeness of interpretation, and such convenience and accessibility. The comprehensive aim of this dictionary is to define all the words in the Bible not self-explanatory."

We are sorry that we cannot subscribe to all of this, but the *absolute accuracy*, and *authoritativeness* of interpretation, and the *scope* and *fulness* are more than we can admit. If the book were called a Protestant Bible Dictionary, or if accuracy, authoritativeness, scope and fulness were claimed from a Protestant point of view only, we should admit the claim, but we cannot admit it without limitation. As we have already pointed out in the *Quarterly* when reviewing former volumes, Catholic interpretation of texts which are subjects of controversy is either altogether ignored or passed over lightly. There are many instances of this in former volumes; there are several in the volume before us. This quotation from the article on "Priest" will serve as an illustration:

"The New Testament does not apply the word ἱερεύς to any Christian minister, nor indeed to any minister at all, except so far as the people of God are spoken of as a royal priesthood. It is easy to see why Christianity is what it is—a perfect and abiding fellowship with God—because it is realized in the Eternal Son of God. It cannot be realized or guaranteed in any other. He is the Mediator of it to whom it owes its character. To introduce into it, no matter how we define their relation to Him, *official* mediators, is to relapse from the Melchizedek priesthood to the Aaronic; it is in principle to apostatize from Christianity. The pictorial use of language borrowed from the old religion is, of course, intelligible enough. . . . But there is not, as in the nature of the case there could not be, any trace in the New Testament of a Christian priest making sacrifice for sin, and mediating again between God and man."

In the article on "Sacrifice," after quoting the doctrine of the Church as defined by the Council of Trent in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and we are grateful for the quotation, although it is brief, the writer says:

"It would be out of place to develop the general objections to this view, which involves the grave religious defect of suggesting that salvation rests on an incomplete and therefore insecure foundation. The relevant objections are that the tenet of transubstantiation,

which is the presupposition of the theory, has no scriptural warrant, while the interpretation of the Eucharist as a perpetual propitiatory offering is inconsistent with the New Testament teaching that the sacrifice of Christ was expiatory, and was offered once for all."

Under the heading "Power of the Keys" we are informed that: "The binding and loosing are not, in this case any more than elsewhere to be interpreted as the absolving and retaining of sins; they seem to mean the prescribing what the offender is to do and not to do."

These quotations will be sufficient to show that Catholic belief and practice get but scant courtesy in this latest Encyclopædic Dictionary which claims to have such absolute accuracy and authoritativeness of interpretation. A work that makes such claims ought to live up to them. Moreover, may we not reasonably suspect that the writers for this Dictionary who through ignorance or prejudice act unfairly in regard to Catholic matters, will be unreliable in regard to other matters?

It is not our purpose to try to detract from the many excellencies of the work, but we feel bound in justice to call the attention of Catholic students to the complexion of a book which so openly tries to destroy Penance, the Holy Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Priesthood in one volume.

THE FAITH OF OLD ENGLAND. A Popular Manual of Instructions in the Catholic Faith from a Doctrinal and Historical Standpoint. By the *Rev. Vincent Hornyold, S. J.* 12mo., pp. xi.—191. London: Catholic Truth Society.

Here is an excellent addition to the many useful publications of the London Truth Society. These publications are rapidly covering the whole field of Catholic doctrine, history and worship in brief but comprehensive form. They may well be compared to grains of seed, small and sometimes almost insignificant in form, but which bear fruit a hundred-fold. The volume before us is more pretentious in form, and wider in scope than many that have preceded it, but it is marked by the general characteristics of all the publications of the Society: it is clear, concise, convincing.

The author begins with this graceful apology and explanation:

"There are many manuals of instructions in the Catholic faith already in circulation, some one may say; why then add to their number?

"My reply is simple. If the book exists which would meet the needs of the class of enquirers I have before my mind, I have not been fortunate enough to come across it.

"I should wish to have a manual of instructions written in the

simplest language, yet not too elementary to satisfy an enquiring mind, and of a price to place it within reach of all.

"I should like to have arguments drawn from Scripture, the Councils of the Church, and the teaching of the early Christian writers, all doing their part, while history retained its proper place. It must tell us its sad yet soul-stirring story of the love of our forefathers for the faith which had been brought to them from Rome; it must show how it came about that England was forced into schism, and how, as a nation, she fell away from the Truth.

"How few know anything of the persecution undergone with such unostentatious heroism by English Catholics for three hundred years and more! Surely the better we realize how cruel were the measures adopted to stamp out the Faith in Old England, the more we shall love and value the heirloom which has been handed down at the cost of so much suffering.

"Then, again, I should wish to find included in such a work as I have in view, a brief exposition of the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic faith; for I know that in the case of some—perhaps I ought to say of many—difficulties arise where there is question of purchasing two or three books which may be required to cover the necessary ground.

"Last, but not least, certain questions which—however useful in time gone by—at the present day rarely come under discussion, might be expected to make place for others that are agitating the minds of non-Catholics, and especially of the members of the High Church party; many of whom, dissatisfied with the claims of the Anglican Establishment to form part of the Catholic Church, are groping in the dark after truth."

No one will deny that there is a demand for such a manual. All priests who have instructed non-Catholics must have experienced the difficulty of placing in their hands the right book. There is no question of *books*, but *a* book. We do not believe it is possible to make every stage of progress, but we know nothing better of its size than the volume before us for intelligent persons who believe in revealed religion, and want to find the Church of God.

De Deo Uno et Trino: Disputationes Theologicæ in Iam Partem D. Thomae, Qu. ii., XLIII. Auctore *Josepho M. Piccirelli, S. J.* Neapoli, Michael D'Auria, 1902.

The author of this work is well known to professional students of scholastic divinity through his profound *Disputationes Metaphysicae de Deo* which was published in Paris some twenty years ago. The present work carries forward and develops on the plane of theology

the purely philosophical truths of its predecessor. The extraordinary bulk of the volume—comprising over fourteen hundred small quarto pages—may seem in these days of manuals and primers to call for an apology. Even the most ardent courtier of the "queen of science" must have some leisure for other duties and the varied demands of life—to say nothing of other studies and to leave in the dim distance the urgency of the newspaper and the latest novel. But how to husband time and energy, physical as well as psychological, so as to satisfy those claims and still find a residue for the study required to do justice to so profound and broad a treatment of the most difficult subject of theology may well be considered a difficult problem of private economy. The author has not overlooked at least his responsibility for the insistance of the difficulty; and so he reassures the student at the start by observing that some three hundred pages of the work are occupied by the text of the forty-two corresponding questions reprinted from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas and about one hundred more pages by supplementary citations from the other works of the Angelic Doctor. Thus about a thousand pages alone are given to the *Commentary*, an amount of matter usually covered by a year's study in the higher schools of Divinity. Accepting this arithmetical explanation of the volume's goodly proportions the serious student will not regard it in the light of an apology, for he realizes that only in quartos and folios can the vast truths of theology receive a just presentation and development. St. Thomas must have felt sensibly the restrictions he placed, not on himself so much as on the large truths of theology by endeavoring to condense them into the *Summa*. Doubtless it would have been a special joy to him could he have foreseen that his devoted followers would liberate those truths from their limited environment and bring them forth into the broad air and sunlight which only the ample space of tomes such as Father Piccerelli knows how to construct can afford them. It has been a prudent thought on his part to have reprinted with his own commentary the corresponding text of St. Thomas. The student's convenience is thus consulted and his personal contact with the works of the Angelic Doctor ensured. The author's regard for his readers' accommodation is further evidenced by the copious analytic index by which the immense wealth of argument and reference is brought under a ready survey. The large clear letter press, moreover, is a feature for which the reader of a book of this kind will not be ungrateful.

For the rest our spatial limitations do not permit us to set forth the author's theological opinions. Besides, they appeal only to the special student of theology and he will want to read them for himself. Suffice it to note that an effort throughout is apparent to re-

flect the full mind of St. Thomas. The controversies of the schools are given their full measure of justice, quantitative and qualitative. Though Thomistic the author, it need hardly be said, is not a Thomist.

HISTOIRE DE LIVRES DU N. TESTAMENT. Par *E. Jacquier.* Tome I., pp. xii., 491. Paris, 1903. Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90. Price, 3½ francs.

The present volume forms part of an extensive series of special studies entitled a *Library of Ecclesiastical History.* The design of the series is to furnish professors, students and educated Catholics generally with a collection of works dealing with subjects of special importance in the history of the Church, that shall be abreast with the progress of modern criticism. The aim is not to provide manuals of instruction nor popular historical narratives, but to furnish instruments of higher education in accordance with the views expressed by Leo XIII. on historical studies. Thus far six volumes of the *Library* have appeared: *Christianity and the Roman Empire,* by M. Paul Allard; *Ancient Christian Literature,* the Greek by Mgr. Batiffol and the Syriac by M. Duval; the *Great Schism of the West,* by M. Salembier; the *Church and the Beginnings of the Renaissance,* by M. Guiraud, and lastly the present *History of the Books of the New Testament,* by M. Jacquier. That these monographs supply a demand may in some degree be inferred from the multiplied editions into which they have already passed. That the latest accession is quite up to the grand excellence of its predecessor will doubtless be attested by similar external evidence, and no prolonged perusal of the book will be needed to provide the internal evidence to the same effect. The controlling purpose of the work is to place the Books of the New Testament in their original historical and doctrinal environment. To this end the philosophical and especially the religious ideas of their authors, the intellectual and social conditons of the readers for whom they wrote, and the events which occasioned their writing are described. This necessitated setting forth the arguments for the authenticity of the original documents, an analysis of their contents, and a special exposition of their directive ideas. The order of development does not follow that of the contents of the New Testament. It is chronological. The Epistles of St. Paul, the dates of which are more exactly known, are alone dealt with in the present volume. The synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Epistles and the Johannine writings are to be treated in a subsequent volume. The main body of the work is introduced by discussions on the Chronology and Language of the New Testament. The study of the Pauline Epistles is preceded by

a biography of their author. The Letters to the Thesalonians are assigned to the first place and are followed in order by those to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans. Those to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and the Philippians are ascribed to the time of St. Paul's captivity. The Pastoral Epistles (to Titus and Timothy) and the Epistle to the Hebrews are given the subsequent places. At the head of each chapter a bibliography is given containing the most important books—especially the more recent and fully developed. Besides this a brief supplement contains a short bibliograph of general works and of those relating especially to St. Paul. Nothing therefore is wanting as regards the apparatus for a thorough study of the subject matter. One who reads the present volume will be eager for the coming of its companion, in which the rest of the New Testament books will be dealt with.

SERMONS FOR ALL THE SUNDAYS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, AND THE PRINCIPAL FESTIVALS. For the use of Parish Priests and for Private Reading. By *Rev. George Deshon,* of the Paulist Fathers. Cloth, 500 pages, $1.00. Catholic Book Exchange, 120 West Sixtieth Street, New York.

Father Deshon cannot be accused of rushing into print. All that he says is the result of the experience of a long, active life well spent in the service of God. He has put to the test the material that he presents to younger workmen, and he knows its value. He cannot possibly be moved by the vanity that might influence a younger man, without perhaps his knowledge. Only the best motives influence him to mount a higher pulpit from which he can reach a larger audience, as advancing years render it more difficult for him to speak from the old platform.

But hear him as to his purpose:

"In preparing these Sermons, as far as I am able to judge, I have endeavored to forget myself, and aimed only at the good of my hearers.

"I have tried to use simple and straightforward language, so as to be clearly and easily understood;

"To give a higher idea of the power, wisdom and goodness of God, our Creator, and our nothingness as creatures;

"Of the immensity and glorious character of the eternal destiny prepared for us, and the dreadful consequences of our failure to attain it;

"To magnify the goodness of God in redeeming us, and His readiness to give us abundant graces to help us to attain it;

"To explain that the essence of religion does not consist in sentiment and feeling, but in a sincere obedience;

"That the road of obedience is not too difficult, but as our Saviour says, 'easy and light' to all who are well disposed;

"To inspire a generous enthusiasm to keep the commandments, not only in the letter, but also in the spirit;

"That each one in his own state of life should ardently desire to conform himself in all things to the will of God as far as he can ascertain it."

One who knows the preacher better than we shall speak for him:

"What makes these sermons especially attractive is their direct and practical bearing on the life of souls. Father Deshon is an old missionary, and has had a life-long experience both in preaching and directing souls, and these sermons are the best flowering of his life's work. There is, moreover, about them a quaint mystical flavor that comes from an intimate acquaintance with the old writers of ascetical theology.

"Most priests find a sermon that stimulates their own thoughts the only one of value. To have this stimulating quality a sermon must have an original character, and there must be about it a certain attractive flavor of simplicity and directness. Father Deshon's sermons possess these qualities in a most eminent degree."

DISCOURSES DOCTRINAL AND MORAL. By the *Most Rev. Dr. McEvilly,* Archbishop of Tuam. 8vo., pp. 382. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Venerable Archbishop of Tuam is a striking example of the truth, that the busiest man does most work. Notwithstanding the many exacting demands made upon him by his manifold routine duties, he finds time in the midst of distractions to devote to literary work. His commentaries on certain books of the Sacred Scriptures are well known and highly valued. Those who have learned the merits of that work will be particularly interested in the present work. It is a collection of seventy-five sermons preached at different times and on several occasions. They were written to be preached and not to be published. Not until his friends had repeatedly requested it did he at last consent to their publication. He thus states his purpose:

"Should they help in any way in the salvation of souls, by arousing the sinner to a sense of his sadly degraded condition, and converting him from the evil of his ways, aided by the all powerful grace of God; and serve to stimulate the just, to advance steadily and perseveringly in the road of Christian perfection, thus contributing to the glory of God, and small trouble undergone in connection with

them will not be undertaken in vain, and shall thus be amply repaid.

"We have had in view, in their publication, to remedy, in some measure, a great defect connected with most of the sermons with which the world is flooded, especially those imported from abroad. That defect is the absence of scriptural quotations and especially their appropriate application.

"This is the more to be deplored, as nothing imparts such strength to a sacred discourse, nothing so appropriate, nothing so acceptable to the hearers, nothing so calculated to bring a blessing on the labors of a preacher, as the appropriate quotation of the Word of God Himself.

"Now it is humbly hoped this glaring defect may to a certain extent be remedied in the following discourses."

This lack of Scriptural quotation is a pretty general evil, and Archbishop McEvilly does well to call attention to it. His sermons abound with quotations from the Bible and the Fathers that lend a special value to them. The frequent references to doctrinal matter will fit the reader with replies to the errors of the day and enable him on occasion to meet the attacks of unbelievers. The subjects treated include Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell, Sin, Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, Catholic Education, and the principal feasts. They are full of character and worthy of publication.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS, a *Joanne Petro Gury, S. J.*, Conscriptum et ab Antonio Ballerini, Einsdem Societatis, adnotationibus auctum, deinde vero ad breviorem formam exaratum atque ad usum Seminariorum Huius Regionis Accomodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S. J., in Collegio Woodstockiensi, Md., Theologiæ Moralis Professor. Editio Decima Sexta Recognita a Timotheo Barrett, S. J. 8vo., pp. 904. New York: Pustet & Co.

The first edition of this excellent book came from the press in 1884; now we have the sixteenth before us. This were proof sufficient of the excellence of the work. It has retained its popularity with no change in the text, except what was rendered necessary by decrees of the Roman Congregations, although many other manuals of moral theology, by distinguished and learned authors, have in the meantime made tempting bids for popular favor. Sabetti's Moral Theology is so well known that it might seem superfluous to speak of it in detail, and yet so long a time has elapsed since its first appearance, so many other manuals have followed it, and it does so admirably all that is claimed for it that we shall describe briefly its plan and scope as set forth by the author. It is a compendium of Gury's Moral Theology reduced to a new and shorter form, and adapted to the necessities and customs of this country. The excellence of Gury enriched with the notes of Ballerini was

sufficient to restrain the author from making an altogether new manual, but he found the notes so numerous as to be confusing, and therefore he omitted annotations altogether, embodying in the text the more important and necessary ones.

Moreover, all those parts of Gury which are limited in application to other countries and are of no practical use here, have been eliminated. In their place, matter drawn from our Plenary Councils and other approved sources has been inserted. This course insures a practical manual, since Moral Theology consists to a great extent in practical applications and must take on a certain diversity and local character according to the country for which it is written.

Father Sabetti has gotten rid of much antiquated matter by introducing the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" and the most recent decrees of the Roman Congregations.

In one respect especially the author has enlarged on Gury. The latter gives small space to "Probability," and "Equal Probably;" Father Sabetti devotes more attention to them, not in a controversial spirit, but to bring out more clearly the teaching of the master St. Alphonsus on these important subjects.

The author's whole purpose may be summed up in this way: to make a short practical manual of Moral Theology for seminarians and priests leading the active life of the mission. He has succeeded admirably. In practice the theologian will almost always find a sufficient answer in this book for all difficulties. It is in truth a manual.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS ET PASTORALIS, ad mentem S. Thomæ et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernis moribus accommodata. T. 1.—De Pœnitentia, Matrimonio et Ordine. Auctore Ad. Tanquerey, S. S. 8vo., pp. xxiii., 661. Neo-Eboraci: Fratres Benziger.

Students of theology will be glad to learn that Father Tanquerey has begun the publication of a work on moral theology. His dogma rapidly made its way into favor, and those who are acquainted with its unusual merits will have a special welcome for this work on morals by the same author.

In the present work he tells us that he does not confine himself to casuistry, but that he treats of morals in a doctrinal and speculative way also. Even pastoral theology is included in the work, to some extent.

St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus are the chief guides. After them come Suarez, De Lugo and Billuart, and among the most recent authors, Carriere, Lehmkuhl, Müller and Ballerini are quoted. The author is unusually clear. The language is easy, the divisions and subdivisions are helpful, the statement of different opinions brief and fair, and the conclusion logical and practical.

Many authors, even very learned ones, gather together an array of authorities that simply bewilders the average student, and after pitting them against one another, singly and in groups, like combatants in the arena, until they become one struggling mass, leave the spectator to make peace, and decide the merits of the case for himself. Now this is precisely what the average student cannot do, and should not be asked to do. There is too much speculation in most manuals, and not enough practice. Father Tanquerey is making a practical book. One which the seminarian can use to fit him for the mission, and one which the priest can use as a daily hand book.

Two distinctive features of the work are, that it is up to date, and that it is adapted to the conditions of this country. Two peculiarities of it are that the civil law of Matrimony is treated in an appendix, and that the treatment of questions "de Impotentia, de Debito Conjugali," and "de Baptizandis Foetibus," is reserved for a Supplement. The book is excellent from a material point of view. The paper, type, and binding are most inviting. We recommend it without reservation.

ONWARD AND UPWARD: a Year Book, compiled from the Discourses of Archbishop Keane. By *Maurice Francis Egan.* 12mo., pp. 387. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

The compiler thus states the purpose of the book: "The main object of this book is, in the view of the compiler, to give to earnest men and women, often too busy for long meditation, a spiritual keynote for each day in the year. And Archbishop Keane knows our country and the human heart, our conditions and our struggles and temptations so well, that from the work of no other man could be drawn sentiments at once so spiritual and so practical, so stimulating and so sustaining for the great mass of the American people."

The volume is divided into twelve parts corresponding to the twelve months of the year. There is a page for each day of each month. On each page is printed an extract from some discourse of the Archbishop. All the extracts for each month treat of one subject, so that they are all grouped under twelve headings. These are: Right Living, Religion, Home, Education, The Ideal Woman, The Ideal Man, Civilization, America, Progress, Art, Brotherhood, Death and Resurrection.

It will be seen at a glance that these are all important subjects, and timely ones. Those who have heard the learned author speak on them know how clearly and forcibly he always expresses himself. He has the essential quality of a public speaker and writer which is very often wanting, clearness.

Perhaps the strongest group of selections in the book is made up of those which treat of "Brotherhood." It may be they strike the reader more forcibly because of their peculiar fitness to the times when misunderstandings between employer and employe are more frequent, when strikes are commoner, and when socialistic tendencies are more widespread. It would certainly do great good if these declarations on the subject could be placed in the hands of the contending parties.

CARMINA MARIANA. Second Series. An English Anthology in Verse in honor of and in relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and arranged by Orby Shipley, M. A. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. liv., 560. London: Burns & Oates.

When the First Series of Carmina Mariana appeared every one was surprised at the extent and variety of the poetic tributes to our Blessed Lady and through her to the mystery of the Incarnation. As a writer in the Spectator said: "It is important as a witness to the marvelous agreement, through vast periods full of change in recognition of the Mother of Christ. Readers of Catholic prayer books are sometimes startled by the varied epithets applied to her. This book is witness that in none of them sanctioned in Catholic practice, is there novelty of respect. It seems certain that the Christian Church of East and West accepted, rather than imposed, the cult which the common reverence of Catholics spontaneously and logically offered."

The words of praise poured out in praise of the collection were abundant and universal. We feel sure that the Second Series will be as warmly welcomed. It is fully equal to the First in extent, variety and general excellence.

It was most desirable that this good work which was postponed so long should at last be done completely, and all those interested in the work will rejoice that the same loving editorial hand has guided the Second Series safely into the light. They will rejoice still more to learn that he is now engaged on the Third and last Series. When this has appeared we shall probably have the most complete collection of verse on any one subject in the English language or any other language.

Catholics should rejoice in this triumph of their dear Mother, and encourage the learned author by subscribing for his books.

BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE. An Illustrated Catholic Monthly. Folio pp. 50 each number. $2.00 a year. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Benziger Brothers are succeeding in producing a first class Catholic Illustrated Magazine. We had already the Catholic World, Donahue's and the Messenger, all excellent in their way, but not

intended to fill the same want that Benziger's Magazine supplies. It is essentially a family magazine, not intended to supplement secular publications of the same kind, but to supplant them. This was really necessary, because none of the secular magazines are altogether safe in the family circle. Some offend oftener and more flagrantly than others, but they all offend frequently enough to require expunging. It may be a story, or part of a story; it may be a poem, it may be a pictures, or perhaps only an advertisement, but the poison is none the less dangerous because hidden. We could not be expected to go through our magazines with scissors in hand to excise them before giving them to our children, and hence the need of a Catholic magazine which would take their place. One with all their good features, and none of their bad ones. Such a book must contain all the departments of interest furnished by the secular magazines which appeal to the different members of the household, with the best illustrations and yet be Catholic in tone. Such a book Benziger Brothers are making.

It is like Harper's and Collier's in form, and the large folio pages give excellent opportunities for large illustrations. It was a very serious undertaking, requiring great outlay and much risk, and therefore the publishers deserve the more credit and better support. If sample copies could be placed in every Catholic household in the land, we feel sure that the circulation would be rapidly and enormously increased.

Six months' subscription may be purchased for one dollar.

Historic Highways of America. Vol. I., Paths of the Mound-Building Indians and Great Game Animals. Vol. II., Indian Thoroughfares. By *Archer Butler Hulbert*. With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 140 and 152. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

These two volumes are the first and second of a series of sixteen on the History of America as portrayed in the evolution of its highways of War, Commerce, and Social Expansion. "The more important highways will be specifically treated with reference to the national needs which they temporarily or permanently satisfied. The study of any highway for itself alone might prove of indifferent value; but the story of a road, which shows clearly the rise, nature, and passing of a nation's need for it, is of great importance."

"Part one of the first volume treats of the distribution of the mound-building Indians, and the evidence that the earliest Red Men found and opened the great land thoroughfares on the watersheds of America. The second part treats of the range and habits of the great game animal—the buffalo."

The second volume, which deals with Indian thoroughfares, is

particularly interesting, because in it the author has given the first public record of explorations which have made him the authority on this branch of archæology. The inexperienced reader will be surprised to learn that Indian trails which appear to be wandering paths leading directly to no particular point, in reality cover the country with a network, and lead by the straightest practicable courses to all strategic points.

This volume contains the result of years of study of the pioneer period. This interesting and valuable contribution to the history of the country will be confined to a limited edition printed directly from type, which will be immediately distributed. The work is sold in sets only, and it will be necessary for those who wish to possess it to order promptly. It is expected that a new volume will appear every two months.

Relation de Terre Sainte (1533-1534) par Greffin Affagart, publiée avec une introduction et des notes par *J. Chavanon*, archiviste paléographe, correspondant du Ministère de l'Instruction publique. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 rue Bonaparte. 1902. I. Vol. illustré de xxvii., 245 pages. Prix, 5 francs.

This volume contains the narrative, now published for the first time, of a pilgrimage made to the Holy Places by a French gentleman in the sixteenth century, in company with a learned Franciscan, Rev. Father Brochard. In preparing this account M. Chavanon has been at great pains to follow carefully the sole remaining manuscript.

A lengthy preface introduces the author and his work. The text is accompanied with notes, critical, historical and geographical, and obsolete terms are fully explained. Further, an artistic character is given to the edition by illustrations borrowed from the most celebrated works on the Holy Land of the same epoch as the narrative itself and by two new phototypes of Cyprus.

As a result we have a fine work, instructive and at the same time edifying—a work that all who are interested in Biblical studies and the Holy Land, and more generally all who enjoy picturesque narratives of the travels of a former age, should possess.

Practical Explanation and Application of Bible History. Edited by Rev. John J. Nash, D. D. 8vo., pp. 518. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The reverend author tells us his purpose by quoting Cardinal Vaughan's commendation of Knecht's Commentary, which runs thus: "To show in what ways the Inspired Writings are of practical use to Christian life, to mark their application to conduct as they are perused by the youthful reader, is to render a great service to our Holy Religion."

He has translated and edited Siegel's "Katechetischer Leitfaden,"

and has followed the lines laid down in that work. He has, however, pruned the original and added some things which he hopes will make it interesting and practical. The work is intended for catechism teachers, and is arranged entirely in questions and answers. These are not supposed to exhaust the subject, but rather to suggest fuller thought. The principal merit claimed for the work is the practical application at the close of each chapter.

MARIÆ CORONA. Chapters on the Mother of God and His Saints. By the *Rev. P. A. Sheehan, D. D.*, author of "My New Curate," "Luke Delmege," and other works. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Benziger Brothers. Dublin: Catholic Truth Society.

Of the twelve chapters in the book five treat of the Blessed Virgin under the titles: "Morning Star," "Tower of Ivory," "Glory of Israel," "Mother of God" and "Queen of Saints." The other chapters are devoted to St. Augustine, St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, St. Patrick, St. Dominic, St. Teresa, St. Alphonsus and St. Aloysius. They are beautifully written and are full of devotion and learning. They may be used for spiritual reading, and would serve excellently without alteration for sermons or lectures. The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland is to be commended for inducing Father Sheehan to put into type what had remained in manuscript too long.

"THE SAINTS"—Saint Dominic. By *Jean Guiraud.* Translated by Katharine de Mattos. 12mo., pp. 194. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This latest addition to the series which has been appearing in French and English under the direction of M. Joly, possesses all the charm and merit of each of its predecessors. The picture true to life framed by the historical events that accompanied the person is again reproduced in simple, but clear language, and brief but comprehensive form. This series is gradually filling the place which it began to occupy in the beginning, and it will have a permanent value that will probably last indefinitely.

SERMONS FROM THE LATINS. Adapted from Bellarmine, Segneri and Other Sources. By *Rev. James J. Baxter, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 618. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This book contains a sermon for each Sunday in the year, and for some of the principal feasts. The reverend author tells us that he has not translated the sermons from Latin writers verbatim, but that from a study of these authors he has constructed a series of sermons. He has followed principally Cardinal Bellarmin's "Consciones Sacrae."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

TRACES OF ELDER FAITHS OF IRELAND: a Folklore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. By *W. G. Wood-Martin, M. R. I. A.*, Author of "Pagan Ireland," "The Lake Dwellings of Ireland," etc. With numerous illustrations. Two volumes. 8vo., pp. xii., 405, and xii., 438. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

DE FIDE DIVINA, Libri Quatuor. Auctore *Gulielmo Wilmers, S. J.* Opus Postumum post mortem auctoris editum cura Augustini Lehmkuhl, S. J. 8vo., pp. 415. Neo Eboraci: Fredericus Pustet.

RECOLLECTIONS OF HALF A CENTURY. By *Colonel Alexander K. McClure.* 8vo., pp. 502. Illustrated. Salem Press Co., Salem, Mass.

EARTH TO HEAVEN. By *Monsignor John S. Vaughan,* Domestic Prelate of Leo XIII. Author of "Life After Death," "Thoughts for All Times," "Faith and Folly," etc. 8vo., pp. xiv., 184. St. Louis: B. Herder.

POLITICAL AND MORAL ESSAYS. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.*, B. Sc. Oxon. 12mo., pp. 298. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE MIRROR OF PERFECTION. Being a Record of St. Francis of Assisi ascribed to His Companion Brother Leo of Assisi, and now translated by Constance, Countess de La Warr, with an Introduction by Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE CONVENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN. By *Francesca M. Steele* (Darley Dale). With a Preface by Father Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. xxv., 320, with numerous portraits. St. Louis: B. Herder.

LETTERS TO YOUNG MEN. By *Henri Dominique Lacordaire,* of the Order of Friars Preachers. New Edition revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. xiv., 236. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION. Speeches and Sermons by *Mandell Creighton, D. D., D. C. L., LL. D.*, etc. Edited by Louise Creighton. 12mo., pp. xii., 215. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

NEW AND COMPLETE ENGLISH-GERMAN AND GERMAN-ENGLISH POCKET DICTIONARY, with the Pronunciation of both Languages, enriched with the technical terms of the Arts and Sciences. By *J. F. L.* and *L. H. Tafel.* 16mo, pp. 874. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

IN THE DAYS OF KING HAL. By *Marion Ames Taggart.* 12mo., pp. 172. Illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE DEATH OF SIR LAUNCELOT, and Other Poems. By *Conde Benoist Pallen.* 12mo., pp. 124. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.

A MARTYR OF THE MOHAWK VALLEY and Other Poems. By *P. J. Coleman.* 12mo., pp. 132. New York: Messenger Press, 27 West Sixteenth street.

A ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE CATHOLIC GERMAN NOVELISTS. With Portraits, Biographical Sketches and Bibliography. 12mo., pp. 235. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE HARMONY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By *Herman J. Heuser,* Overbrook Seminary. 12mo., pp. 247, with frontispiece. New York: Benziger Brothers.

DE PERFECTIONE VITAE SPIRITUALIS, *R. P. Antonii Le Gaudier, S. J.* Editio recens emendata cura et studio P. A. M. Micheletti, S. J. Tom. I. Augustae Taurinorum (Turin), Typogr. P. Marietti. Londinum apud Thomas Baker, 1903. Pp. xiv., 604.

TWENTY-FIVE PLAIN CATHOLIC SERMONS ON USEFUL SUBJECTS, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By *Father Clement Holland.* 12mo., pp. 422. Second Series. London: Thomas Baker.

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Comprising Dogma, Moral and Worship. By a Seminary Professor. 12mo., pp. xiv., 587. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

FORTY-FIVE SERMONS, written to meet Objections of the Present Day. By *Rev. James McKernan,* of the Diocese of Trenton, N. J. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Pustet & Co.